

In the name of Allah, the All Merciful,
The Mercy-Giving

The following is a concise, non-verbose introduction to some of the terminologies of the science of *hadīth* that should suffice in helping one understand the commentary of the book, *Mishkāt al-Masābīh*.

Know that the term *hadīth*, according to the technical usage of the majority of the *hadīth* scholars, applies to:

1. The statements of the Prophet (may Allah bless him and grant him peace),
2. His actions, and
3. His consent.

“Consent” means that someone did or said something in the Prophet’s presence (may Allah bless him and grant him peace) and that he did not reject the action nor prohibit him from it; rather he remained silent and consented.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

مُقَدَّمَةٌ فِي بَيَانِ بَعْضِ
مُصْطَلَحَاتِ عِلْمِ الْحَدِيثِ مِمَّا
يَكْفِي فِي شَرْحِ الْكِتَابِ مِنْ غَيْرِ
تَطْوِيلٍ وَ إِطْنَابٍ.

اعْلَمُ أَنَّ الْحَدِيثَ فِي إِصْطَلَاحِ
جُمُهُورِ الْمُحَدِّثِينَ يُطْلَقُ عَلَى قَوْلِ
النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَ سَلَّمَ وَ فِعْلِهِ
وَ تَقْرِيرِهِ

وَ مَعْنَى التَّقْرِيرِ أَنَّهُ فَعَلَ أَحَدٌ أَوْ
قَالَ شَيْئًا فِي حَضُورِهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَ سَلَّمَ وَ لَمْ يُنْكِرْهُ وَ لَمْ يَنْهَهُ عَنْ
ذَلِكَ بَلْ سَكَّتَ وَ قَرَرَ.

The term “ḥadīth” applies likewise to the statements, action, and consent of a Companion¹ (*Sahābi*) ²

As well as to the statements, action, and consent of a Successor (*Tābi’i*).³

A ḥadīth that is attributed to the Prophet (may Allah bless him and grant him peace) is termed *marfū’*.

A ḥadīth attributed to a Companion, however, is termed *mawqūf*.

And a ḥadīth attributed to a Successor is termed *maqtū’*.

وَ كَذَلِكَ يُطْلَقُ عَلَى قَوْلِ الصَّحَابِيِّ
وَ فِعْلِهِ وَ تَقْرِيرِهِ
وَ عَلَى قَوْلِ التَّابِعِيِّ وَ فِعْلِهِ وَ
تَقْرِيرِهِ.

فَمَا انْتَهَى إِلَى النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ
وَ سَلَّمَ يُقَالُ لَهُ الْمَرْفُوعُ.

وَ مَا انْتَهَى إِلَى الصَّحَابِيِّ يُقَالُ لَهُ
الْمَوْقُوفُ.

كَمَا يُقَالُ قَالَ أَوْ فَعَلَ أَوْ قَرَرَ ابْنُ
عَبَّاسٍ أَوْ عَنِ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ مَوْقُوفًا أَوْ
مَوْقُوفٌ عَلَى ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ.

وَ مَا انْتَهَى إِلَى التَّابِعِيِّ يُقَالُ لَهُ
الْمَقْطُوعُ.

Some of the ḥadīth scholars¹ specified the term “ḥadīth” to imply only the *marfū'* and *mawqūf* ḥadīth, since a *maqtū'* ḥadīth is also called an *athar*.²

وَقَدْ خَصَّ بَعْضُهُمُ الْحَدِيثَ
بِالْمَرْفُوعِ وَالْمَوْقُوفِ إِذَا الْمَقْطُوعُ
يُقَالُ لَهُ الْأَثْرُ.

The word “*athar*”, however, can also apply to *marfū'* narrations, as the term *athar* is used in the term *ad’iyah ma’thūrah*³ (prophetic supplications), which are those supplications which have been narrated on the authority of the Prophet (may Allah bless him and grant him peace).

وَقَدْ يُطْلَقُ الْأَثْرُ عَلَى الْمَرْفُوعِ
أَيْضًا كَمَا يُقَالُ الْأَذْعِيَةُ الْمَأْتُورَةُ
لِمَا جَاءَ مِنَ الْأَذْعِيَةِ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ
صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Tahāwī⁴ named his ḥadīth collection that consists of an explanation of both the prophetic ḥadīth as well as the *athars* of the Companions: “A Commentary on the Meanings of the *Āthār* (pl. *athar*)⁵.”

وَ الطَّحاوِيُّ سَمِّيَ كِتَابَهُ الْمُشْتَمِلَ
عَلَى بَيَانِ الْأَحَادِيثِ النَّبِيَّةِ وَ آثَارِ
الصَّحَابَةِ بِشَرْحِ مَعَانِي الْأَثَارِ.

And Sakhāwī has stated that Ṭabarī⁶ has a book named “The Rarefaction of the *Āthār*”

It is specific to *marfū'* ḥadīth. As for the *mawqūf* ḥadīth mentioned in it, they are mentioned but incidentally.

وَقَالَ السَّخَاوِيُّ إِنَّ لِلطَّبَرَانِيَّ كِتَابًا
مُسَمَّى بِتَهْذِيبِ الْأَثَارِ مَعَ أَنَّهُ
مَخْصُوصٌ بِالْمَرْفُوعِ وَمَا ذُكِرَ فِيهِ
مِنَ الْمَوْقُوفِ فِي طَرِيقِ التَّبَعِ وَ
الْتَّطَّلِ.

According to the more popular opinion, the terms “*khabar*” and “*ḥadīth*” are synonymous.

وَ الْخَبْرُ وَ الْحَدِيثُ فِي الْمَشْهُورِ
بِمَعْنَى وَاحِدٍ.

Some have specified the term “*ḥadīth*” to mean that which was narrated on the authority of the Prophet (may Allah bless him and grant him peace).

وَ بَعْضُهُمْ خَصُّوا الْحَدِيثَ بِمَا جَاءَ
عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَ سَلَّمَ
وَالصَّحَابَةَ وَ التَّابِعِينَ وَالْخَبَرِ بِمَا جَاءَ
مِنْ أَخْبَارِ الْمُلُوكِ وَ السَّلَاطِينِ وَ
الْأَيَّامِ الْمَاضِيَّةِ.

Consequently, the one who occupies himself in the study of the *sunnah* is called a “*muhaddith*” and the one who occupies himself in the study of historical narrations is called an “*akhbāri*”³.

وَ لِهَذَا يُقَالُ لِمَنْ يَشْتَغِلُ بِالسُّنْنَةِ
مُحَدِّثٌ وَ لِمَنْ يَشْتَغِلُ بِالتَّوَارِيخِ
أَخْبَارِيٌّ

The attribution of a *ḥadīth* to the Prophet (may Allah bless him and grant him peace) is sometimes explicit (*ṣariḥ*) and sometimes implicit (*hukmi*).

وَ الرُّفْعُ قَدْ يَكُونُ صَرِيْحًا وَ قَدْ
يَكُونُ حُكْمًا.

An example of an explicit statement is when a Companion says: "I heard the Messenger of Allah (may Allah bless him and grant him peace) saying..."

or when a Companion or someone else says:

"The Messenger of Allah (may Allah bless him and grant him peace) said..."

or if someone says "from the Messenger of Allah (may Allah bless him and grant him peace) that he said..."

An example of an explicit action is when a Companion says:

"I saw the Messenger of Allah (may Allah bless him and grant him peace) do..."

or if he says: "from the Messenger of Allah (may Allah bless him and grant him peace) that he did..."

or if someone says: "from a Companion or someone else... it is raised"

or when a narrator states: "the Companion raised it (the ḥadīth)."

أَمَّا صَرِّحًَا فَفِي الْقَوْلِ كَقَوْلِ
الصَّحَابِيِّ سَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى
اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَقُولُ كَذَا

أَوْ كَقَوْلِهِ أَوْ قَوْلِ غَيْرِهِ قَالَ رَسُولُ
اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

أَوْ عَنْ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَ
سَلَّمَ أَنَّهُ قَالَ كَذَا.

وَ فِي الْفِعْلِيِّ كَقَوْلِ الصَّحَابِيِّ رَأَيْتُ
رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
فَعَلَ كَذَا

أَوْ عَنْ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَ
سَلَّمَ أَنَّهُ فَعَلَ كَذَا

أَوْ عَنِ الصَّحَابِيِّ أَوْ غَيْرِهِ مَرْفُوعًا أَوْ
رَفِعَةُ أَنَّهُ فَعَلَ كَذَا.

An example of an explicit consent is when a Companion or someone else says: "So and so (*fulān*) did such and such in the presence of the Prophet (may Allah bless him and grant him peace)" and then does not mention his disapproval.

وَ فِي التَّقْرِيرِيِّ أَنْ يَقُولَ الصَّحَابِيُّ
أَوْ غَيْرُهُ فَعَلَ فُلَانٌ أَوْ أَحَدٌ بِحَضْرَةِ
النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَ سَلَّمَ كَذَا وَ
لَا يَذْكُرُ إِنْكَارًا.

An example of an implicit statement is when a Companion, not narrating from the early scriptures¹, but narrating that in which there is no room for individual analytical reasoning, narrates historical events, stories of the Prophets, or stories of that which is to come, like the [prophesized] wars, tribulations, and the terrors of the Day of Resurrection; or narrates a specific reward or punishment resultant of a particular action, since there can be no means to attaining this knowledge except through direct oral transmission from the Prophet (may Allah bless him and grant him peace).

وَ أَمَّا حُكْمًا فَكَإِخْبَارِ الصَّحَابِيِّ
الَّذِي لَمْ يُخْبِرْ عَنِ الْكُتُبِ الْمُتَقْدَمَةِ
مَا لَا مَحَالَ فِيهِ لِلإِجْتِهَادِ عَنِ
الْأَحْوَالِ الْمَاضِيَّةِ كَأَخْبَارِ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ
أَوِ الْآتِيَّةِ كَالْمَلَأِحِمِ وَ الْفِتَنِ وَ
أَهْوَالِ يَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ أَوْ عَنْ تَرْتِيبِ
ثَوَابِ مَخْصُوصٍ أَوْ عِقَابِ مَخْصُوصٍ
عَلَى فِعْلٍ فَإِنَّهُ لَا سَبِيلَ إِلَيْهِ إِلَّا
السَّمَاعُ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَ
سَلَّمَ

An example of an implicit action is when a Companion commits an act in which there is no room for individual reasoning.

An example of an implicit consent is when a Companion narrates that the Companions used to do something in the time of the Prophet (may Allah bless him and grant him peace), because it is assumed that he (may Allah bless him and grant him peace) was aware of it and that revelation had descended concerning it.

Similarly, implicit consent is implied when they say: "Such and such is from the *sunnah*", because the assumption is that "*sunnah*" refers to the *sunnah* of the Messenger of Allah (may Allah bless him and grant him peace).

Some scholars, however, have stated it can imply the *sunnah* of the Companions or the Righteous Caliphs as well, since the word *sunnah* also applies to them.

أَوْ يَفْعَلُ الصَّحَابِيُّ مَا لَا مَحَالَ

لِلإِجْتِهَادِ فِيهِ

أَوْ يُخْبِرُ الصَّحَابِيُّ بِأَنَّهُمْ كَانُوا
يَفْعَلُونَ كَذَا فِي زَمَانِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ
عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ لِأَنَّ الظَّاهِرَ إِطْلَاقُهُ
صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى ذَلِكَ وَ
نُزُولُ الْوَحْيِ بِهِ.

أَوْ يَقُولُونَ وَمِنَ السُّنْنَةِ كَذَا لِأَنَّ

الظَّاهِرُ أَنَّ السُّنْنَةَ سُنْنَةُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ

صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
وَقَالَ بَعْضُهُمْ أَنَّهُ يَحْتَمِلُ سُنْنَةَ
الصَّحَابَةِ وَسُنْنَةَ الْحَلْفَاءِ الرَّاشِدِينَ
فَإِنَّ السُّنْنَةَ يُطْلَقُ عَلَيْهِ.

فَصْلٌ

A *sanad* is the pathway¹ (or chain) of a ḥadīth,
i.e. the group of men who transmitted it.

السَّنَدُ طَرِيقُ الْحَدِيثِ وَهُوَ رِجَالُهُ
الَّذِينَ رَوَوْهُ

The term *isnād* has the same connotation although it sometimes is used to mean “the act of mentioning a ḥadīth chain” or “the act of narrating the pathway of a ḥadīth text”.

وَ الْإِسْنَادُ بِمَعْنَاهُ وَ قَدْ يَحْمِلُ بِمَعْنَى
ذِكْرِ السَّنَدِ وَ الْحِكَايَةِ عَنْ طَرِيقِ
الْمَتْنِ.

The *matn* of a ḥadīth is what the chain (*sanad*) concludes at.³

وَ الْمَتْنُ مَا انْتَهَى إِلَيْهِ الْإِسْنَادُ.

If no narrator amongst the narrators of a chain is omitted then the ḥadīth is considered *muttaṣil*.

The absence of such interruption (omitted narrators) is called *ittiṣāl*.⁴

فَإِنْ لَمْ يَسْقُطْ رَأْوٌ مِنَ الرُّوَاةِ مِنَ
الْبَيْنِ فَالْحَدِيثُ مُتَّصِلٌ وَ سُمِّيَ عَدَمُ
السُّقُوطِ إِتْصَالًاً.

If one or more narrators in a chain, however, are missing then the ḥadīth is termed *munqati'*. Such omission is termed *inqitā'* (interruption).

وَ إِنْ سَقَطَ وَاحِدٌ أَوْ أَكْثَرُ
فَالْحَدِيثُ مُنْقَطِعٌ وَ هَذَا السُّقُوطُ
إِنْقِطَاعٌ.

The omission of a narrator sometimes occurs at the beginning of a chain, and is subsequently termed *mu'allaq*. Such an omission is called *ta'līq* (suspension).

And in it the omitted narrators can be one or more.

Sometimes the entire *sanad* is omitted, as is the habit of some ḥadīth compilers who state [directly] that: “the Messenger of Allah (may Allah bless him and grant him peace) said...”

There are numerous *ta'līqāt* (plural of *ta'līq*) in the chapter headings of *Sahīh al-Bukhārī*, and they fall under the ruling of uninterrupted ḥadīth because Bukhārī adhered to only mention in his book that which was *sahīh*.²

وَ السُّقُوطُ إِمَّا أَنْ يَكُونَ مِنْ أَوَّلِ
السَّنَدِ وَ سُمِّيَ مُعَلَّقًا وَ هَذَا
الْإِسْقَاطُ تَعْلِيَّةً

وَ السَّاقِطُ قَدْ يَكُونُ وَاحِدًا وَ قَدْ
يَكُونُ أَكْثَرَ

وَ قَدْ يُحْذَفُ تَمَامُ السَّنَدِ كَمَا هُوَ
عَادَةُ الْمُصَنِّفِينَ يَقُولُونَ قَالَ رَسُولُ
اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَ سَلَّمَ.

وَ التَّعْلِيَّقَاتُ كَثِيرَةٌ فِي تَرَاجِمِ
صَحِيحِ الْبُخَارِيِّ وَ لَهَا حُكْمُ
الْإِتَّصَالِ لِأَنَّهُ اتَّزَمَ فِي هَذَا الْكِتَابِ
أَلَّا يَأْتِي إِلَّا بِالصَّحِيحِ.

They are not, however, at the same rank as his *musnad* ḥadīth (connected and grounded) except for [those *ta liqāt* ḥadīth which] he mentioned in another place in his book in connected form (*musnad*)³.

The *ta liqāt* are sometimes differentiated by the fact that those which Bukhārī mentioned in an absolute or active voice, such as: “so and so said” or “so and so mentioned”

indicated that its chain was established in his view and therefore definitely *sahīh*, and as for what he mentioned with wordings of doubt or in the passive voice⁴, such as: “it has been said”, “it is said” or “it was mentioned”, then according to him there was some debate over its authenticity.

Since he narrated it in this book (*Sahīh al-Bukhārī*), however, it is assumed to have a firm basis, and due to this [the ḥadīth scholars have] stated that the *ta liqāt* of Bukhārī are all uninterrupted (*muttaṣil*) and *sahīh*.

When an omission occurs at the end of a chain⁵, if it is after a Successor, the ḥadīth is termed *mursal*. This action of omitting a Companion is termed *irsāl*

وَ لَكِنَّهَا لَيْسَتْ فِي مَرْتَبَةِ مَسَانِيدِهِ
إِلَّا مَا ذَكَرَ مِنْهَا مُسْنَدًا فِي مَوْضِعٍ
آخَرَ مِنْ كِتَابِهِ

وَ قَدْ يُفَرَّقُ فِيهَا بِأَنَّ مَا ذَكَرَ
بِصِيغَةِ الْجُزْمِ وَ الْمَعْلُومِ كَقُولِهِ قَالَ
فُلَانٌ أَوْ ذَكَرَ فُلَانٌ
دَلَّ عَلَى ثُبُوتِ إِسْنَادِهِ عِنْدَهُ فَهُوَ
صَحِيحٌ قَطُّعًا وَ مَا ذَكَرُهُ بِصِيغَةِ
الْتَّمْرِيْضِ وَ الْمَجْهُولِ كَقِيلٍ وَ يُقَالُ
وَ ذُكِرَ فِي صِحَّتِهِ عِنْدَهُ كَلَامٌ

وَ لَكِنَّهُ لَمَّا أُورَدَهُ فِي هَذَا الْكِتَابِ
كَانَ لَهُ أَصْلٌ ثَابِتٌ وَ لِهَذَا قَالُوا
تَعْلِيقَاتُ الْبُخَارِيِّ مُتَّصِلَةٌ صَحِيحَةٌ

وَ إِنْ كَانَ السُّقُوطُ مِنْ آخِرِ السَّنَدِ
فَإِنْ كَانَ بَعْدَ التَّابِعِيِّ فَالْحَدِيثُ

(expedition), i.e. if a Successor said [directly that]: “The Messenger of Allah (may Allah bless him and grant him peace) said...”⁶

Sometimes the terms *mursal* and *munqati'* are applied to the same meaning.

Although the first terminological usage is more popular.

According to the majority of the scholars, the ruling for *mursal* ḥadīth is to abstain from judgment¹,

because it is not known if the omitted individual is reliable or not, since the Successors at times narrate from [other] Successors and amongst the Successors are both reliable and unreliable narrators.

According to Abū Ḥanīfah and Mālik, the *mursal* ḥadīth is accepted unconditionally².

مُرْسَلٌ وَ هَذَا الْفِعْلُ إِرْسَالٌ كَقَوْلٍ
الْتَّابِعِيُّ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ
عَلَيْهِ وَ سَلَّمَ

وَ قَدْ يَحْيِيُ عِنْدَ الْمُحَدِّثِينَ الْمُرْسَلُ
وَ الْمُنْقَطِعُ بِمَعْنَىٰ .

وَ الْإِصْطِلَاحُ الْأَوَّلُ أَشْهَرُ

وَ حُكْمُ الْمُرْسَلِ التَّوْقُفُ عِنْدَ
جُمُهُورِ الْعُلَمَاءِ لِأَنَّهُ لَا يُدْرِى إِنَّ
السَّاقِطُ ثِقَةٌ أَوْ لَا،

لِأَنَّ التَّابِعِيَّ قَدْ يَرْوِيُ عَنِ التَّابِعِيِّ
وَ فِي التَّابِعِيْنَ ثِقَاتٌ وَ غَيْرُ ثِقَاتٍ .

وَ عِنْدَ أَبِي حَنِيفَةَ وَ مَالِكِ الْمُرْسَلُ
مَقْبُولٌ مُطْلَقاً.

They state that [a reliable narrator] only expedites due to his complete trust and confidence [in the omitted narrator], since the discussion is in regards to reliable narrators. If the ḥadīth was not *sahīh* according to him, he would not have expedited and stated: “the Messenger of Allah (may Allah bless him and grant him peace) said...”

According to Shāfi‘ī if a *mursal* chain is supported by another chain that is either *mursal* or *musnad* (connected), even if it is weak, it will be accepted.³

Aḥmad has two recorded opinions on this issue⁴.

All of this [discussion] pertains to when it is known that the habit of that Successor is not to expedite except through reliable narrators.

وَ هُمْ يَقُولُونَ إِنَّمَا أَرْسَلَهُ لِكَمَالِ
الْوُثُوقِ وَ الْإِعْتِمَادِ لِأَنَّ الْكَلَامَ فِي
الشِّقَةِ وَ لَوْ لَمْ يَكُنْ عِنْدَهُ صَحِيحٌ
لَمْ يُرْسِلُهُ وَ لَمْ يَقُلْ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ
صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَ سَلَّمَ.

وَ عِنْدَ الشَّافِعِيِّ إِنْ اعْتَضَدَ بِوَجْهِ
آخَرَ مُرْسَلٍ أَوْ مُسْنَدٍ وَ إِنْ كَانَ
ضَعِيفًا قُبْلًا.

وَ عَنْ أَحْمَدَ قَوْلَانِ
وَ هَذَا كُلُّهُ إِذَا عُلِمَ أَنَّ عَادَةَ ذَلِكَ
الْتَّابِعِيِّ أَنْ لَا يُرْسَلَ إِلَّا عَنِ
الشِّقَاتِ.

If it is his habit to expedite through both reliable and unreliable narrators, however, then it is unanimously agreed upon to abstain from judgment.

وَإِنْ كَانَتْ عَادَتُهُ أَنْ يُرْسَلَ عَنِ
الشَّقَاتِ وَعَنْ غَيْرِ الشَّقَاتِ فَحُكْمُهُ
الْتَّوْقُفُ بِالْإِتْفَاقِ.

It has been mentioned as such.¹ Further details exist on this topic and have been mentioned by Sakhāwī in his commentary on the *Alfiyyah*.²

كَذَا قِيلَ وَفِيهِ تَفْصِيلٌ أَزْيَدُ مِنْ
ذَلِكَ ذِكْرُهُ السَّخَاوِيُّ فِي شَرْحِ
الْأَلْفِيَّةِ.

If an omission takes place in the middle of a chain, then if the omitted narrators are two in number and they are consecutive, the ḥadīth is termed *mu‘dal*.

وَإِنْ كَانَ السُّقُوطُ مِنْ أَثْنَاءِ
الإِسْنَادِ فَإِنْ كَانَ السَّاقِطُ اثْنَيْنِ
مُتَوَالِيَا يُسَمَّى مُعْضَلًا بِقَتْحِ الضَّادِ.

If there are one or more omissions in separate places in a chain, the ḥadīth is termed *munqati‘*.

وَإِنْ كَانَ وَاحِدًا أَوْ أَكْثَرَ مِنْ غَيْرِ
مَوْضِعٍ وَاحِدٍ يُسَمَّى مُنْقَطِعًا.

According to this definition, *munqati‘* is one of the categories of non-*muttasil* (broken-chained) ḥadīth.

وَعَلَى هَذَا يَكُونُ الْمُنْقَطِعُ قِسْمًا
مِنْ غَيْرِ الْمُتَّصِلِ

Sometimes, *munqati'* connotes the opposite meaning of *muttaṣil* and therefore includes all of the [previously-mentioned] types [of interrupted hadīth, such as the *mursal*, *mu'dal*, *mu'allaq*, etc...]. According to this definition, *munqati'* [is a broad term that] can be further divided into subcategories (i.e. the *mursal*, *mu'dal*, etc...).³

Inqitā' (breaks in a chain) and narrator-omission can be realized by recognizing that the narrator and the person he is narrating from couldn't have met because they didn't live during the same time period, didn't ever really meet, or because the *shaykh* did not give permission to the person to narrate from him. This recognition is governed by knowledge of history that delineates the birth and death dates of narrators.

As well as the specifics of their study and travel times.

Due to which the knowledge of history became a primary resource and basic reference for the ḥadīth scholars.⁴

Amongst the categories of *munqati'* ḥadīth is the *mudallas* ḥadīth. The act of omission that occurs in such a ḥadīth is called *tadlīs* (concealment, camouflage) and the one who does it a *mudallis* (concealer).

وَ قَدْ يُطْلَقُ الْمُنْقَطِعُ بِمَعْنَى غَيْرِ
الْمُتَّصِلِ مُطْلَقاً شَامِلاً لِجِمِيعِ
الْأَقْسَامِ وَ بِهَذَا الْمَعْنَى يُجْعَلُ مُقَسَّماً

وَ يُعْرَفُ الْإِنْقِطَاعُ وَ سُقُوطُ الرَّاوِيْ
بِمَعْرِفَةِ عَدَمِ الْمُلَاقَةِ بَيْنَ الرَّاوِيْ وَ
الْمَرْوِيِّ عَنْهُ إِمَّا بِعَدَمِ الْمُعَاصَرَةِ أَوْ
عَدَمِ الْإِجْتِمَاعِ وَ الْإِجْهَارِ عَنْهُ
بِحُكْمِ عِلْمِ التَّارِيْخِ الْمُبَيِّنِ لِمَوَالِيِّ
الرَّوَاةِ وَ وَفَيَاتِهِمْ وَ تَعَيْنِيْنِ أَوْقَاتِ
طَلَبِهِمْ وَ إِرْتَحَالِهِمْ

وَ بِهَذَا صَارَ عِلْمُ التَّارِيْخِ أَصْلَالاً وَ
عُمَدَةً عِنْدَ الْمُحَدِّثِيْنَ.

وَ مِنْ أَقْسَامِ الْمُنْقَطِعِ الْمُدَلَّسُ
بِضَمِّ الْمِيمِ وَ فَتْحِ الْلَّامِ الْمُشَدَّدَةِ

وَ يُقَالُ لَهُذَا الْفِعْلُ التَّدْلِيسُ وَ
لِفَاعِلِهِ مُدَلْسٌ بِكَسْرِ الْأَمِ

Tadlis occurs when a narrator does not name the *shaykh* whom he in fact heard the *ḥadīth* from. Rather, he narrates from the one above his direct *shaykh* using such [ambiguous] wording that deludes one to believe that it may have been heard directly, although it cannot be conclusively said to be a falsification [due to the ambiguity of the wording].¹ For example, if the narrator states: “From (‘an) so and so” or “so and so said” (as opposed to “I heard so and so say” or “so and so told me...”)²

Tadlis, linguistically, means to hide the defect of a product in a sales transaction.

It is also said to be derived from the word “*dalas*” which means the blending of darkness [with light] or the intensification of darkness.

Tadlis in *ḥadīth* studies is termed as such because of the shared meaning of ambiguity.³

وَ صُورَتُهُ أَنْ لَا يُسَمِّي الرَّاوِي
شَيْخَهُ الَّذِي سَمِعَهُ مِنْهُ بَلْ يَرْوِي
عَمَّنْ فَوْقَهُ بِلَفْظٍ يُوَهِّمُ السَّمَاعَ وَ
لَا يَقْطَعُ كَذِبًا كَمَا يَقُولُ عَنْ فُلَانٍ
وَ قَالَ فُلَانُ.

وَ التَّدْلِيسُ فِي الْلُّغَةِ كِتْمَانُ عَيْبِ
السُّلْعَةِ فِي الْبَيْعِ.

وَقَدْ يُقَالُ إِنَّهُ مُشَتَّقٌ مِنَ الدَّلَسِ وَ
هُوَ إِخْتِلاطُ الظَّلَامِ وَ إِشْتِدَادُهُ

سُمِّيَ بِذَلِكَ لَا شُرِّاكَهِمَا فِي الْخَفَاءِ

Shaykh [Hāfiẓ Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalānī] states⁴: “The ruling on the one regarding whom *tadlīs* is established is that [his ḥadīth] should not be accepted from him except when he explicitly clarifies direct transmission.”¹

Shaykh states: “*Tadlīs* is *ḥarām* (impermissible) according to the Imams.

It has been narrated from Wakī‘³ that he said: ‘It is not permissible to commit *tadlīs* of a garment (hide its defects to a customer), so how [can it be permissible to commit] *tadlīs* with a ḥadīth?’ Shu‘bah⁴ was very severe in its condemnation.”⁵

The scholars have differed in regards to accepting the narration of a person who commits *tadlīs*.

One group amongst the experts of ḥadīth and *fiqh* held that *tadlīs* should be a reason to declare unreliability and that whoever was known to do it his ḥadīth should not be accepted under any circumstances.

قَالَ الشَّيْخُ وَ حُكْمُ مَنْ ثَبَّتَ عَنْهُ
الْتَّدْلِيسُ أَنَّهُ لَا يُقْبَلُ مِنْهُ إِلَّا إِذَا
صَرَّحَ بِالْتَّحْدِيثِ.

قَالَ الشَّيْخُ التَّدْلِيسُ حَرَامٌ عِنْدَ
الْأَئِمَّةِ.

رُوِيَ عَنْ وَكِيعٍ أَنَّهُ قَالَ لَا يَحِلُّ
تَدْلِيسُ الثَّوْبِ فَكَيْفَ بِتَدْلِيسِ
الْحَدِيثِ؟ وَ بَالَّغَ شُعْبَةُ فِي ذَمَّهِ.

وَ قَدِ اخْتَلَفَ الْعُلَمَاءُ فِي قَبْوِلِ رِوَايَةِ
الْمُدَلِّسِ.

فَذَهَبَ فَرِيقٌ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْحَدِيثِ وَ
الْفِقْهِ إِلَى أَنَّ التَّدْلِيسَ جَرْحٌ وَ أَنَّ
مَنْ عُرِفَ بِهِ لَا يُقْبَلُ حَدِيثُهُ مُطْلَقاً

It has also been said, however, that [such a person's ḥadīth] should be accepted.

The majority [of ḥadīth scholars] adhered to accept the *tadlīs* of the one who only does it from someone reliable (*thiqah*), like [Sufyān] Ibn ‘Uyaynah⁶, and to reject the one who conceals [both] weak and non-weak narrators⁷, until he clarifies that he heard it by saying: “I heard” or “He transmitted to us” or “He informed us”.

Some people are driven to commit *tadlīs* by wicked intention, such as concealing that one has heard [the report] from a *shaykh* due to the *shaykh*’s young age or due to his lack of fame and status amongst people.

As for the *tadlīs* that was committed by some of the *akābir* (senior ḥadīth narrators)¹, it was not due to [such intentions], rather it was due to their confidence in the authenticity of the report and the absence of need [to

وَ قِيلَ يُقْبَلُ.

وَ ذَهَبَ الْجُمْهُورُ إِلَى قَبْوِلِ تَدْلِيسٍ
مَنْ عُرِفَ أَنَّهُ لَا يُدَلِّسُ إِلَّا عَنْ ثِقَةٍ
كَابِنٍ عَيْيَنَةٍ وَ إِلَى رَدِّ مَنْ كَانَ
يُدَلِّسُ عَنِ الْضُّعْفَاءِ وَ غَيْرِهِمْ حَتَّى
يُنَصَّ عَلَى سَمَاعِهِ بِقَوْلِهِ سَمِعْتُ أَوْ
حَدَّثَنَا أَوْ أَخْبَرَنَا.

وَالْبَاعِثُ عَلَى التَّدْلِيسِ قَدْ يَكُونُ
لِبَعْضِ النَّاسِ غَرَضٌ فَاسِدٌ مِثْلُ
إِخْفَاءِ السَّمَاعِ مِنَ الشَّيْخِ لِصِغَرِ
سِنِّهِ أَوْ عَدَمِ شُهُرَتِهِ وَ جَاهِهِ عِنْدَ
النَّاسِ.

وَالَّذِي وَقَعَ مِنْ بَعْضِ الْأَكَابِرِ لَيْسَ
لِمِثْلِ هَذَا بَلَهُ مِنْ جِهَةٍ وُثُوقُهُمْ

mention the narrator] due to the popularity of his condition.

لِصِحَّةِ الْحَدِيثِ وَاسْتِغْنَاءِ بِشُهْرَةِ
الْحَالِ.

Shumunnī states that it is possible that the elder heard the ḥadīth from a group of reliable narrators and also from that man [who was omitted], so he felt no need to mention him after mentioning one of [the reliable narrators] or after mentioning all of them due to his conviction in the authenticity of the ḥadīth, just as the *mursil* (narrator of an expedited ḥadīth)² does.³

قَالَ الشَّمْنِي يَحْتَمِلُ أَنْ يَكُونَ قَدْ
سَمِعَ الْحَدِيثَ مِنْ جَمَاعَةٍ مِنَ الثَّقَاتِ
وَعَنْ ذَلِكَ الرَّجُلِ فَاسْتَغْنَى بِذِكْرِهِ
عَنْ ذِكْرِ أَحَدِهِمْ أَوْ ذِكْرِ جَمِيعِهِمْ
لِتَحْقِيقِهِ بِصِحَّةِ الْحَدِيثِ فِيهِ كَمَا
يَفْعَلُ الْمُرْسِلُ.

If discrepancy occurs between the narrators in a chain (*isnād*) or text (*matn*) due to the advancement, deferment, addition, omission, or switching of one narrator in the place of another or a text in place of [another] text, or through distortion in the names of the [narrators of the] chain, or through [distortion], summation, or omission of parts of the text, or something similar, then the ḥadīth is termed *muḍṭarib*.

وَإِنْ وَقَعَ فِي إِسْنَادٍ أَوْ مَتْنٍ
اخْتِلَافٌ مِنَ الرُّوَاةِ بِتَقْلِيْمٍ وَ تَأْخِيْرٍ
أَوْ زِيَادَةٍ وَ نُقْصَانٍ أَوْ إِبْدَالٍ رَأَوْ
مَكَانَ رَأَوْ آخَرَ أَوْ مَتْنٍ مَكَانَ مَتْنٍ
أَوْ تَصْحِيفٍ فِي أَسْمَاءِ السَّنَدِ أَوْ
أَجْزَاءِ الْمَتْنِ أَوْ بِاخْتِصَارٍ أَوْ حَذْفٍ
أَوْ مِثْلَ ذَلِكَ فَالْحَدِيثُ مُضْطَرِبٌ.

If reconciliation [of a discrepancy in a *muḍtarib* ḥadīth] is possible then [good], and if not then cessation [from judgment on the ḥadīth's strength is necessary]¹.

فَإِنْ أَمْكَنَ الْجَمْعُ فِيهَا وَ إِلَّا
فَأَتَّوْقَفُ.

If a narrator interpolates his speech or the speech of someone else, such as a Companion or Successor, [into the ḥadīth text] for any particular reason, such as to clarify the language (wording), to explain a meaning, to restrict unrestricted wording, or something of that sort, then the ḥadīth is termed *mudraj*.

وَ إِنْ أَدْرَجَ الرَّاوِيْ كَلَامَهُ أَوْ كَلَامَ
غَيْرِهِ مِنْ صَحَابِيْ أَوْ تَابِعِيْ مَثَلًا
لِغَرَضٍ مِنَ الْأَغْرَاضِ كَبَيَانِ الْلُّغَةِ أَوْ
تَفْسِيرِ لِلْمَعْنَى أَوْ تَقْيِيدِ لِلْمُطْلَقِ أَوْ
نَحْوِ ذَلِكَ فَالْحَدِيْثُ مُدْرَجُ.

فَصْلٌ

تَنِيَّهٌ

This discussion leads us to [the issue of] narrating and transmitting a ḥadīth through its meaning (non-verbatim transmission).

وَ هَذَا الْمَبْحَثُ يَنْجُرُ إِلَى رِوَايَةِ
الْحَدِيْثِ وَ نَقْلِهِ بِالْمَعْنَى

On this issue, there is a difference of opinion.

وَ فِيهِ اخْتِلَافٌ

The majority hold the opinion that it is permissible [to transmit ḥadīth non-verbatim] only for someone who is knowledgeable in Arabic, proficient in the manners and modes of speech, special constructions, and the meanings (*mafhūmāt*) of speech, so that he does not err by way of addition or omission of meanings.

It is, however, also claimed that non-verbatim transmission is permissible only with singular words and not compounded words.

It is also claimed by others only to be permissible for the one who accurately recalls the words of the ḥadīth such that he is able to [properly] change [the ḥadīth wording without distorting the meaning].

Others claim that it is only permissible in the case of the one who had memorized the meanings of the ḥadīth but forgot its exact wording, since permissibility is due to the necessity of benefiting from its rulings. As for the one who remembers the exact wording, it is not permissible for him due to the absence of necessity.

فَالْأَكْثَرُونَ عَلَى أَنَّهُ جَائِزٌ مِّنْهُ
عَالَمٌ بِالْعَرَبِيَّةِ وَ مَاهِرٌ فِي أَسَالِيبِ
الْكَلَامِ وَ خَوَاصِ التَّرَاكِيبِ وَ
مَفْهُومَاتِ الْخُطَابِ إِنَّا لَيُخْطِئُ
بِزِيَادَةٍ وَ نُفْصَانٍ

وَ قِيلَ جَائِزٌ فِي مُفْرَدَاتِ الْأَلْفَاظِ
دُونَ الْمُرَكَّبَاتِ

وَ قِيلَ جَائِزٌ لِمَنِ اسْتَخْضَرَ الْفَاظَةُ
حَتَّى يَتَمَكَّنَ مِنَ التَّصَرُّفِ فِيهِ

وَ قِيلَ جَائِزٌ لِمَنْ يَحْفَظُ مَعَانِي
الْحَدِيثِ وَ نَسِيَ الْفَاظَاهَا لِلضَّرُورَةِ
فِي تَحْصِيلِ الْأَحْكَامِ وَ أَمَّا مَنِ
اسْتَخْضَرَ الْأَلْفَاظَ فَلَا يَجُوزُ لَهُ لِعَدَمِ
الضَّرُورَةِ

Note that this difference of opinion is in regards to permissibility and impermissibility.

As for the preference of narrating verbatim, this is an agreed-upon stance based upon the statement [of the Prophet (may Allah bless him and grant him peace)]: “May Allah enlighten the face of the individual who heard my speech, protected it, and then conveyed it as he heard it.”¹ As for nonverbatim transmission, it has occurred in the Six Books (the Six Authentic Ḥadīth Collections) as well as in others.²

An ‘anah is to narrate a ḥadīth with the wording: “From so and so, from so and so (‘an fulān ‘an fulān)”. The *mu‘an‘an* report is a ḥadīth narrated through the use of ‘an ‘anah.

[For the narrators to have] lived in the same era is a condition for the acceptance of ‘an ‘anah ḥadīth according to Muslim, while [evidence of] the narrators having met physically is a condition of Bukhāri. According to another group of scholars, [it is a condition for evidence to exist that a narrator actually] learnt from the other.¹ Muslim refuted both groups severely and exaggerated in doing so.²

وَ هَذَا الْخِلَافُ فِي الْجُوازِ وَ عَدَمِهِ.

أَمَّا أَوْلَوِيَّةُ رِوَايَةِ الْفَظْلِ مِنْ غَيْرِ
تَصْرِيفٍ فِيهَا فَمُتَّفَقُ عَلَيْهِ لِقَوْلِهِ
صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَ سَلَّمَ نَصَرَ اللَّهُ أَمْرًا
سَمِعَ مَقَالَتِي فَوَعَاهَا فَأَدَّاهَا كَمَا سَمِعَ
الْحَدِيثَ وَ النَّقْلُ بِالْمَعْنَى وَاقِعٌ فِي
الْكُتُبِ السَّتَّةِ وَ غَيْرِهَا.

وَ الْعَنْعَنَةُ رِوَايَةُ الْحَدِيثِ بِلَفْظِ عَنْ
فُلَانٍ عَنْ فُلَانٍ وَ الْمُعَنْعَنُ حَدِيثٌ
رُوَى بِطَرِيقِ الْعَنْعَنَةِ.

وَ يُشَرَّطُ فِي الْعَنْعَنَةِ الْمُعَاصِرَةِ عِنْدَ
مُسْلِمٍ وَ الْقِرْبَانِ عِنْدَ الْبُخَارِيِّ وَ
الْأَخْذُ عِنْدَ قَوْمٍ آخَرِينَ وَ مُسْلِمٌ رَدَّ
عَلَى الْفَرِيقَيْنِ أَشَدَّ الرَّدِّ وَ بَالَّغَ فِيهِ.

The ‘an’anah of a mudallis is unacceptable.³

Every *marfū’* ḥadīth whose chain is *muttaṣil* (uninterrupted) is termed *musnad*.

This is the popular and relied upon [usage of the term *musnad*].

Some scholars label every *muttaṣil* ḥadīth *musnad*, even if it is *mawqūf* or *maqtū’*.

Some scholars call every *marfū’* ḥadīth *musnad*, even if it is *mursal*, *mu’dal*, or *munqati’*.

وَ عَنْعَنَةُ الْمُدَلِّسٍ عَيْرُ مَقْبُولٍ.

وَ كُلُّ حَدِيثٍ مَرْفُوعٍ سَنْدُهُ مُتَّصِلٌ
فَهُوَ مُسْنَدٌ.

هَذَا هُوَ الْمَشْهُورُ الْمُعْتَمَدُ عَلَيْهِ

وَ بَعْضُهُمْ يُسَمِّي كُلَّ مُتَّصِلٍ
مُسْنَدًا وَ إِنْ كَانَ مَوْقُوفًا أَوْ
مَقْطُوعًا

وَ بَعْضُهُمْ يُسَمِّي الْمَرْفُوعَ مُسْنَدًا وَ
إِنْ كَانَ مُرْسَلًا أَوْ مُعْضَلًا أَوْ
مُنْقَطِلًا

فَصْلٌ

Amongst the categories of ḥadīth are the *shādhdh* (anomalous), *munkar* (unfamiliar), and *mu'allal* (defective) ḥadīth.

Shādhdh lexically means the one who separated from a group and abandoned it.

Legally, [*shādhdh*] is a ḥadīth that is narrated in contradiction to what the reliable narrators narrated.

If the narrators [in the contradictory ḥadīth] are not reliable the ḥadīth should be rejected (*mardūd*).

If they are reliable, then the solution [to the contradiction] is to give preference [to one of the differing ḥadīth] based upon strength of memory, retention and accuracy, greater numbers, or other reasons of preference.

The ḥadīth which is preferred is then termed *mahfūz* and that which was preferred over is termed *shādhdh*.

وَ مِنْ أَفْسَامِ الْحَدِيثِ الشَّاذُ وَ
الْمُنْكَرُ وَ الْمُعَلَّلُ.

وَ الشَّاذُ فِي الْلُّغَةِ مِنْ تَفَرَّدِ مِنَ
الْجَمَاعَةِ وَ خَرَجَ مِنْهَا.

وَ فِي الْإِصْطِلَاحِ مَا رُوِيَ مُخَالِفًا لِمَا
رَوَاهُ الشَّقَاثُ.

فَإِنْ لَمْ يَكُنْ رَوَاتُهُ ثِقَةً فَهُوَ مَرْدُودٌ.

وَ إِنْ كَانَ ثِقَةً فَسَيِّلُهُ التَّرْجِيحُ بِمَرْيِدٍ
حِفْظٍ وَ ضَبْطٍ أَوْ كَثْرَةِ عَدَدٍ وَ
وُجُوهٍ أُخْرَى مِنَ التَّرْجِيحاَتِ.

فَالرَّاجُحُ يُسَمَّى مَحْفُوظًا وَ الْمَرْجُوحُ
شَادِّاً.

A *munkar* report is a ḥadīth which a weak person narrates in opposition to someone who is weaker than him.²

وَ الْمُنْكَرُ حَدِيثٌ رَوَاهُ ضَعِيفٌ
مُخَالِفًا لِمَنْ هُوَ أَضْعَفُ مِنْهُ.

The opposite of [a *munkar* ḥadīth] is a *ma 'rūf* ḥadīth.³

وَ مُقَابِلُهُ الْمَعْرُوفُ.

The narrators in both *munkar* and *ma 'rūf* ḥadīth are weak, although one of them will be weaker than the other.

فَالْمُنْكَرُ وَ الْمَعْرُوفُ كِلَا رَاوِيهِمَا
ضَعِيفٌ وَ أَحَدُهُمَا أَضْعَفُ مِنَ
الآخَرَ.

The narrators in both *shādhdh* and *mahfūz* ḥadīth, however, are strong, although one of them will be stronger than the other.

وَ فِي الشَّاذِ وَ الْمَحْفُوظِ قَوِيٌّ
أَحَدُهُمَا أَفْوَى مِنَ الْآخَرَ.

In comparison, then, *shādhdh* and *munkar* ḥadīth are the rejected forms of the ḥadīth while *mahfūz* and *ma 'rūf* ḥadīth are the preferred forms.

وَ الشَّاذُ وَ الْمُنْكَرُ مَرْجُوحَانِ وَ
الْمَحْفُوظُ وَ الْمَعْرُوفُ رَاجِحَانِ.

Some scholars¹ did not stipulate in *shādhdh* and *munkar* ḥadīth the condition that there be disparity with another narrator, be he strong or weak. Rather, they claimed that the *shādhdh* ḥadīth is simply that which a reliable narrator related independently, without any

وَ بَعْضُهُمْ لَمْ يَشْتَرِطُوا فِي الشَّاذِ وَ
الْمُنْكَرِ قَيْدَ الْمُخَالَفَةِ لِرَأْوِ آخَرَ قَوِيًّا
كَانَ أَوْ ضَعِيفًا وَ قَالُوا الشَّاذُ مَا

accepted ḥadīth in agreement with [its wording and meaning] or supporting it.

رَوَاهُ الشّفَّةُ وَ تَفَرَّدَ بِهِ وَ لَا يُوجَدُ لَهُ
أَصْلٌ مُوَافِقٌ وَ مُعَاصِدٌ لَهُ.

This [definition] would thus be applicable to the *sahīh* [*fard ḥadīth*₂] of a reliable narrator.³ Some scholars⁴ did not consider the existence of a reliable narrator or even disparity in the ḥadīth [as conditions in defining a *shādhah* ḥadīth].

وَ هَذَا صَادِقٌ عَلَى فَرْدٍ ثَقَةٍ صَحِيحٍ
وَ بَعْضُهُمْ لَمْ يَعْتَبِرُوا الشّفَّةَ وَ لَا
الْمُخَالَفَةَ.

Some scholars, however, did not specify the definition of a *munkar* ḥadīth to the previously mentioned application. Rather, they labeled the ḥadīth of the one discredited by *fisq*, excessive negligence, and frequent mistakes as *munkar* as well.

وَ كَذَلِكَ الْمُنْكَرُ لَمْ يَحْصُهُ بِالصُّورَةِ
الْمَذْكُورَةِ وَ سُمِّوا حَدِيثَ الْمَطْعُونِ
بِفِسْقٍ أَوْ فِرْطٍ غَفْلَةٍ وَ كُثْرَةٍ غَلْطَةٍ
مُنْكَرًا.

This is [an issue of] of nomenclature, however, in which there can be no argumentation.

وَ هَذِهِ إِصْطِلَاحَاتٌ لَا مَسَاحَةَ
فِيهَا.

A *mu'allal* ḥadīth is [defined by] a chain that contains impairing defects and subtle, uneasily discernible reasons to degrade the authenticity of a ḥadīth. The well-versed and experienced scholars of

وَ الْمَعَلَلُ يَقْتَحِ الْلَّامُ إِسْنَادُ فِيهِ عَلَى
وَ أَسْبَابُ غَامِضَةٌ خَفِيَّةٌ قَادِحَةٌ فِي
الصَّحَّةِ يَتَنَبَّهُ لَهَا الْحَذَّاقُ الْمَهَرَةُ مِنْ

this science are privy to [these defects], such as expediency (*irsāl*) in the apparently uninterrupted (*mawṣūl*), or the fact that a ḥadīth is really *mawqūf* where it appears *marfū'*, or similar such situations.

At times, the articulation of an extractor of impairing defects (*mu'allil*) falls short of establishing evidence for his claim, just as a money changer falls short in articulating evidence for the defects in a *dīnār* and *dirham*.⁶

When a narrator transmits a ḥadīth and another narrator transmits a ḥadīth in corroboration with it, then the corroborating ḥadīth is called a *mutābi'*.

This is what the ḥadīth scholars mean when they say: "So and so corroborated this ḥadīth." Bukhāri frequently mentions in his *Sahīh*, as well as others, that: "[Such and such ḥadīth] has corroborative chains (*mutābi'āt*)".

أَهْلٌ هَذَا الشَّأنَ كَإِرْسَالٍ فِي
الْمَوْصُولِ وَ وَقْفٍ فِي الْمَرْفُوعِ وَ
نَحْوِ ذَلِكَ.

وَ قَدْ يَقْتَصِرُ عِبَارَةُ الْمُعَلَّلِ بِكَسْرِ
اللَّامِ عَنْ إِقَامَةِ الْحُجَّةِ عَلَى دَعْوَاهُ
كَالصَّيْرَفِيِّ فِي نَقْدِ الدِّينَارِ وَ الدِّرْهَمِ

وَ إِذَا رَوَى رَاوِ حَدِيثًا وَ رَوَى رَاوِ
آخْرُ حَدِيثًا مُوَافِقًا لَهُ يُسَمَّى هَذَا
الْحَدِيثُ مُتَابِعًا بِصِيغَةِ اسْمِ الْفَاعِلِ

وَ هَذَا مَعْنَى مَا يَقُولُ الْمُحَدِّثُونَ
تَابَعَهُ فُلَانٌ وَ كَثِيرًا مَا يَقُولُ
الْبُخَارِيُّ فِي صَحِيحِهِ وَ يَقُولُونَ وَ
لَهُ مُتَابِعَاتٌ.

The effect of corroboration is to strengthen and support a ḥadīth.

A corroborative ḥadīth doesn't have to be equal in status to the original ḥadīth.

Even if it is lesser in status, it will be still suitable for corroboration.

Corroboration (*mutāba 'ah*) can occur with the same narrator¹ or it can be with the *shaykh* above him², and the first (type) is more complete and perfect than the second since weakness in the beginning of the chain³ is more common and frequent.

If the corroborative ḥadīth agrees with the original ḥadīth in word and in meaning the words *mithlahu* are used. However, if the corroboration is in the meaning and not the wording then the words *nahwahu* are used.

In *mutāba 'ah*, it is a condition that the two ḥadīth be from the same Companion.

وَالْمُتَابَعَةُ يُؤْجِبُ التَّقْوِيَةَ وَالْتَّأْيِيدَ

وَلَا يَلْزَمُ أَنْ يَكُونَ الْمُتَابَعُ مُسَاوِيًّا فِي
الْمَرْتَبَةِ لِلْأَصْلِ
وَإِنْ كَانَ دُونَهُ يَصْلُحُ لِلْمُتَابَعَةِ

وَالْمُتَابَعَةُ قَدْ يَكُونُ فِي نَفْسِ
الرَّاوِي وَقَدْ يَكُونُ فِي شَيْخٍ فَوْقَهُ وَ
الْأَوَّلُ أَتَمُّ وَأَكْمَلُ مِنَ الْثَّانِي لِأَنَّ
الْوَهْنَ فِي أَوَّلِ الْإِسْنَادِ أَكْثُرُ وَأَغْلَبُ

وَالْمُتَابَعُ إِنْ وَافَقَ الْأَصْلَ فِي الْلَّفْظِ
وَالْمَعْنَى يُقَالُ مِثْلُهُ وَإِنْ وَافَقَ فِي
الْمَعْنَى دُونَ الْلَّفْظِ يُقَالُ نَحْوُهُ

وَيُشَرَّطُ فِي الْمُتَابَعَةِ أَنْ يَكُونَ
حَدِيثَانِ مِنْ صَحَابَيْ وَاحِدٍ

Now, if the two corroborative ḥadīth are from different Companions, the corroborating ḥadīth is called a *shāhid*. It is said, for example: “This ḥadīth has a *shāhid* from the ḥadīth of Abū Hurayrah” or: “this report has attestations (*shawāhid*)”, or: “the ḥadīth of so and so attests to it”.

Some scholars of ḥadīth specify the word *mutābi‘* to mean only that corroboration that is in the wording (*laf‘*) and the *shāhid* to that corroboration that is in meaning (*ma‘nā*), whether or not the corroboration was from one Companion or two.

Sometimes the terms *shāhid* and *mutābi‘* are used synonymously, and [the reason for this synonymous application] is clear.⁴ The process of investigating the paths of transmission of a ḥadīth and its multiple chains with the intention of discovering a *mutābi‘* or *shāhid* is called *i‘tibār*.

وَ إِنْ كَانَ مِنْ صَحَابِيْنِ يُقَالُ لَهُ
شَاهِدٌ كَمَا يُقَالُ لَهُ شَاهِدٌ مِنْ
حَدِيْثِ أَيِّنِ هُرِيْرَةَ وَ يُقَالُ لَهُ شَوَاهِدٌ
وَ يَشْهُدُ بِهِ حَدِيْثٌ فُلَانٌ

وَ بَعْضُهُمْ يَخْصُّونَ الْمُتَابَعَةَ
بِالْمُوَافَقَةِ فِي الْلَفْظِ وَ الشَّاهِدَةِ فِي
الْمَعْنَى سَوَاءَ كَانَ مِنْ صَحَابِيْنِ وَاحِدٍ
أَوْ مِنْ صَحَابِيْنِ

وَ قَدْ يُطْلَقُ الشَّاهِدُ وَ الْمُتَابَعُ بِمَعْنَى
وَاحِدٍ وَ الْأَمْرُ فِي ذَلِكَ بَيْنُ وَ تَتَبَعُ
طُرُقُ الْحَدِيْثِ وَ أَسَانِيْدِهَا لِقَصْدٍ
مَعْرِفَةِ الْمُتَابَعِ وَالشَّاهِدِ يُسَمَّى
الْإِعْتِيَارَ.

فَصْلٌ

The original division of ḥadīth [based upon the strength of its chains] is into three types: *ṣaḥīḥ* (sound), *ḥasan* (fair), and *da’if* (weak).²

The *ṣaḥīḥ* ḥadīth is of the highest level of strength, the *da’if* the lowest, and the *ḥasan* in between.

All the other types of ḥadīth which have been previously mentioned are subsumed within these three types.

A *ṣaḥīḥ* ḥadīth is that which is established by the transmission of an upright and thoroughly accurate person and which is neither defective nor anomalous.

If these attributes (i.e. being upright and accurate without anomaly or subtle impairing defect) are complete and perfect, then the ḥadīth is considered *ṣaḥīḥ li dhātihi* (*ṣaḥīḥ*-in-itself).

If there is some sort of inadequacy in these characteristics, but various other paths of transmission can make up for the inadequacy, then the ḥadīth is considered *ṣaḥīḥ li ghayrihi* (*ṣaḥīḥ* through corroboration).

وَ أَصْلُ أَفْسَامِ الْحَدِيثِ ثَلَاثَةٌ
صَحِحٌ وَ حَسَنٌ وَ ضَعِيفٌ

فَالصَّحِحُ أَعْلَى مَرْتَبَةٍ وَ الْضَّعِيفُ
أَدْنَى وَ الْحَسَنُ مُتَوَسِّطٌ

وَ سَائِرُ الْأَفْسَامِ الَّتِي ذَكَرْتُ دَاخِلَةٌ
فِي هَذِهِ الْثَلَاثَةِ

فَالصَّحِحُ مَا يَبْثُثُ بِنَقْلٍ عَدْلٍ تَامٌ
الضَّبْطِ غَيْرُ مُعَلَّلٍ وَلَا شَاذٍ

فَإِنْ كَانَتْ هَذِهِ الصِّفَاتُ عَلَى وَجْهِ
الْكَمَالِ وَالْتَّمَامِ فَهُوَ الصَّحِحُ لِذَاتِهِ

وَ إِنْ كَانَ فِيهِ نُوعٌ قُصُورٌ وَ وُجِدَ مَا
يَجْبُرُ ذَلِكَ الْقُصُورَ مِنْ كَثْرَةِ الْطُرُقِ
فَهُوَ الصَّحِحُ لِغَيْرِهِ

When [such supportive paths of transmission] are not found the ḥadīth is considered *hasan li dhātihi* (*hasan-in-itself*).

فَإِنْ لَمْ يُوجَدْ فَهُوَ الْحَسَنُ لِذَاتِهِ

وَمَا فُقِدَ فِيهِ الشَّرَائِطُ الْمُعْتَبَرَةُ فِي
الصَّحِيحِ كُلَّاً أَوْ بَعْضًا فَهُوَ
الضَّعِيفُ

Now, if the paths of transmission of a *da’if* ḥadīth become numerous and the weakness of the ḥadīth is therefore mended³ [through corroboration] the ḥadīth will be considered *hasan li ghayrihi* (*hasan through corroboration*).¹

وَالضَّعِيفُ إِنْ تَعَدَّ طُرُقُهُ وَابْخَرَ
ضَعْفُهُ يُسَمَّى حَسَنًا لِغَيْرِهِ

Although apparently it is possible for all of the above-mentioned attributes of the *sahīh* ḥadīth² to be deficient in a *hasan* ḥadīth, the correct and researched understanding is that only such a deficiency is considered in fair ḥadīth that is due to slightness of accuracy, while the remaining attributes should remain as they are.³

وَظَاهِرُ كَلَامِهِمْ أَنَّهُ يَجُوزُ أَنْ
يَكُونَ جَمِيعُ الصَّفَاتِ الْمَذُكُورَةُ فِي
الصَّحِيحِ نَاقِصًا فِي الْحَسَنِ لِكِنَّ
الْتَّحْقِيقَ أَنَّ النُّقْصَانَ الَّذِي اعْتَبَرَ
فِي الْحَسَنِ إِنَّمَا هُوَ بِخَفَّةِ الضَّبْطِ وَ
بَاقِي الصَّفَاتِ بِحَالِهَا.

Adālah is a faculty in an individual that induces him to adhere to *taqwā* (God-consciousness)¹ and *murū'ah* (a sense of honor).

Taqwā means to avoid evil deeds, such as *shirk* (association with God), *fisq* (moral corruption), and *bid'ah* (repugnant innovation)².

In avoiding minor sins there is a difference of opinion, the preferred opinion being that it is not a condition [for *adālah*] due to its being outside the realm of ability, except in the case of persistence upon [minor sins], as persistence upon them is a major sin.

The meaning of *murū'ah* is that one be free from any vile acts and defects that are contrary to the basic requisite of high ambition and general moral excellence, such as certain permissible but lowly acts, i.e. eating or drinking in a market, urinating on a road, etc....³

وَالْعَدَالَةُ مَلَكَةٌ فِي الشَّخْصِ تَحْمِلُهُ
عَلَى مُلَازَمَةِ التَّقْوَى وَالْمُرْوَعَةِ

وَالْمَرَادُ بِالْتَّقْوَى اجْتِنَابُ الْأَعْمَالِ
السَّيِّئَةِ مِنَ الشَّرِكِ وَالْفِسْقِ وَالْبِدْعَةِ

وَ فِي الْإِجْتِنَابِ عَنِ الصَّغِيرَةِ
خِلَافُ وَ الْمُخْتَارُ عَدْمُ اشْتِرَاطِهِ
لِبُرُوجِهِ عَنِ الطَّاقَةِ إِلَّا إِصْرَارِهِ
عَلَيْهَا لِكَوْنِهِ كَبِيرَةٌ

وَالْمَرَادُ بِالْمُرْوَعَةِ التَّنَزُّهُ عَنْ بَعْضِ
الْحَسَائِسِ وَ النَّقَائِصِ الَّتِي هِيَ
خِلَافُ مُقْتَضَى الْهِمَةِ وَالْمُرْوَعَةِ
مِثْلُ بَعْضِ الْمُبَاحَاتِ الدِّينِيَّةِ
كَالْأَكْلِ وَ الشُّرْبِ فِي السُّوقِ وَ
الْبَوْلِ فِي الْطَّرِيقِ وَ أَمْثَالِ ذَلِكَ

It should be known that integrity in relation to transmission (of ḥadīth) is more general than integrity in testimony (*shahādah*) because integrity in testimony is specific to free men while integrity in transmission (*riwāyah*) includes both free men and slaves.⁴

وَ يَنْبَغِي أَنْ أَنَّ عَدْلَ الرِّوَايَةَ أَعَمُّ
مِنْ عَدْلِ الشَّهَادَةِ فَإِنَّ عَدْلَ
الشَّهَادَةِ مُخْصُوصٌ بِالْأَحْرَرِ وَ عَدْلُ
الرِّوَايَةِ يَشْمَلُ الْأَحْرَرَ وَ الْعَبْدَ

Dabṭ (accuracy) is the ability to memorize what one hears in such a manner that one is fully able to recall it and then prevent it from wholly or partially fading from one's memory.

وَ الْمُرَادُ بِالضَّبْطِ حِفْظُ الْمَسْمُوعِ
وَ تَثْبِيْتُهُ مِنَ الْفَوَاتِ وَالِإِخْتِلَالِ
بِحَيْثُ يَتَمَكَّنُ مِنِ اسْتِحْضَارِهِ

Accuracy is of two types:
1. Accuracy in memory
2. Accuracy in composition

¹

وَ هُوَ قِسْمَانِ ضَبْطُ الصَّدْرِ وَ
ضَبْطُ الْكِتَابِ

Accuracy in memory is attained through memorization and retention in the heart, while accuracy in composition is attained through preservation [of one's writings] until the time of transmission.

فَضَبْطُ الصَّدْرِ بِحِفْظِ الْقَلْبِ وَ وَعْيِهِ
وَ ضَبْطُ الْكِتَابِ بِصِيَانَتِهِ عِنْدَهُ إِلَى
وَقْتِ الْأَدَاءِ.

فَصْلٌ

There are five causes of aspersion in 'adālah (integrity):

إِمَّا الْعَدَالَةُ فَوْجُوهُ الْطَّعْنِ الْمُتَعَلَّمَةُ

إِهَا خَمْسٌ

1. Falsehood (*kidhb*)

الْأَوَّلُ بِالْكَذِبِ

2. Accusation of falsehood (*ittihām bi 'l-kidhb*)

وَ بِإِتْهَامِهِ بِالْكَذِبِ

3. Moral Corruption (*fisq*)

وَ التَّالِثُ بِالْفِسْقِ

4. Being unknown (*jahālah*)

وَ الرَّابُّ بِالْجَهَالَةِ

5. Innovation (*bid 'ah*)

وَ الْخَامِسُ بِالْبِدْعَةِ

Kidhb in respect to a narrator means that his lying about prophetic statements has been established either through the liar's own acknowledgement or through other external evidences.

وَ الْمُرَادُ بِكَذِبِ الرَّاوِي أَنَّهُ ثَبَّتَ
كَذِبَهُ فِي الْحَدِيثِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ
عَلَيْهِ وَ سَلَّمَ إِمَّا بِإِقْرَارِ الْوَاضِعِ أَوْ
غَيْرِ ذَلِكَ وَ الْقَرَائِنُ

وَ حَدِيثُ الْمَطْعُونِ بِالْكَذِبِ

يُسَمَّى مَوْضُوعًا

The ḥadīth of such a liar is termed *mawdū'* (spurious; forged).

If it is established that someone has purposefully lied about a ḥadīth, even if it occurred [only] once in his lifetime and even if he repented from it, his ḥadīth will never be accepted, unlike the one who bears false witness if he repents.

This is the meaning of the term “*mawdū'* ḥadīth” in the nomenclature of the ḥadīth scholars, not that [the narrator’s] lying has necessarily been established and realized in the ḥadīth in question.¹

The issue of forgery is conjectural (based on supposition and not conclusive), and to pass judgment of spuriousness (*wad'*) and lying on a ḥadīth is by way of dominant probability². It is not possible to claim spuriousness conclusively and with certainty [on every ḥadīth of a liar] since liars sometimes also speak the truth.

وَ مَنْ ثَبَتَ عَنْهُ تَعْمُدُ الْكَذِبِ فِي
الْحَدِيثِ وَ إِنْ كَانَ وُقُوعُهُ فِي الْعُمُرِ
مَرَّةً وَ إِنْ تَابَ مِنْ ذَلِكَ لَمْ يُفَلِّ
حَدِيثُهُ أَبَدًا بِخِلَافِ شَاهِدِ الزُّورِ إِذَا
تَابَ

فَالْمُرَادُ بِالْحَدِيثِ الْمَوْضُوعِ فِي
اصْطِلَاحِ الْمُحَدِّثِينَ هَذَا لَا أَعْلَمُ
ثَبَتَ كَذِبُهُ وَ عُلِمَ ذَلِكَ فِي هَذَا
الْحَدِيثِ بِخُصُوصِهِ

وَ الْمَسَأَلَةُ ظَنِّيَّةٌ وَ الْحُكْمُ بِالْوَضْعِ
وَ الْإِفْتَرَاءِ بِحُكْمِ الظَّنِّ الْغَالِبِ وَ لَيْسَ
إِلَيْهِ الْقُطْعُ وَ الْيَقِينُ بِذَلِكَ سَيِّلٌ
فَإِنَّ الْكَذُوبَ قَدْ يَصُدُّقُ

This therefore refutes what has been said concerning the realization of the forgery of the forger through his confession: that it is possible that his confession also be a lie. His truthfulness (attestation to lying) is but known through dominant probability, and were it not for this fact it would not permissible to kill the confessor to murder, nor stone the admitter to fornication.

As for suspicion of falsehood, it applies to when a narrator is famous for and known to lie in general conversation, even if it is not proven that he has lied in the prophetic traditions.

Similar to it in ruling is to narrate that which contradicts the known and necessary principles of Islamic law.

This category of ḥadīth is called *matrūk* (abandoned). For example, they say: "His ḥadīth is *matrūk*," or "so and so is *matrūk* in ḥadīth".

وَ إِنَّمَا يَنْدَعُ مَا قِيلَ فِي مَعْرِفَةِ
الْوَضْعِ بِإِقْرَارِ الْوَاضِعِ أَنَّهُ يَجُوزُ أَنْ
يَكُونَ كَاذِبًا فِي هَذَا الْإِقْرَارِ فَإِنَّهُ
يُعْرَفُ صِدْقَهُ بِغَالِبِ الظَّنِّ وَ لَوْ لَا
ذَلِكَ لَمَّا سَاعَ قَتْلُ الْمُؤْرِرِ بِالْقَتْلِ وَ
لَا رَجْمُ الْمُعْتَرِفِ بِالزِّنَاءِ فَأَفَهُمْ.

وَ أَمَّا اتِّهَامُ الرَّاوِي بِالْكَذِبِ فِي أَنْ
يَكُونَ مَشْهُورًا بِالْكَذِبِ وَ مَعْرُوفًا
بِهِ فِي كَلَامِ النَّاسِ وَ لَمْ يَثْبُتْ كَذِبُهُ
فِي الْحَدِيثِ النَّبِيِّيِّ

وَ فِي حُكْمِهِ رِوَايَةُ مَا يُخَالِفُ قَوَاعِدَ
مَعْلُومَةً ضَرُورِيَّةً فِي الشَّرْعِ كَذَا قِيلَ

وَ يُسَمَّى هَذَا الْقِسْمُ مَتْرُوْكًا كَمَا
يُقَالُ حَدِيثُهُ مَتْرُوْكٌ وَ فُلَانٌ مَتْرُوْكٌ
الْحَدِيثِ

If such a man repents and his repentance is true, and signs of truthfulness become apparent from him it will be permissible to accept his ḥadīth.

وَ هَذَا الرَّجُلُ إِنْ تَابَ وَ صَحَّتْ
تَوْبَتْهُ وَ ظَهَرَتْ أَمَارَاتُ الصَّدْقِ مِنْهُ
جَازَ سَمَاعُ الْحَدِيثِ

In the case of one who lies only occasionally or rarely in his [everyday] speech – and not in the prophetic traditions – such lying will not effectively label his ḥadīth *mawdū'* or *matriūk*, even though it is clear disobedience [of Allah].¹

وَ الَّذِي يَقَعُ مِنْهُ الْكَذِبُ أَحْيَانًا
نَادِرًا فِي كَلَامِهِ غَيْرِ الْحَدِيثِ النَّبَوِيِّ
فَذَلِكَ غَيْرُ مُؤْثِرٍ فِي تَسْمِيَةِ حَدِيثِهِ
بِالْمَوْضُوعِ أَوِ الْمَتْرُوكِ وَ إِنْ كَانَ
مَعْصِيَةً

The term *fisq* (moral corruption) implies moral corruption in deeds and not in belief, for corruption in belief falls under *bid'ah* (innovation).²

وَ أَمَّا الْفِسْقُ فَالْمُرَادُ بِهِ الْفِسْقُ فِي
الْعَمَلِ دُونَ الإِعْتِقَادِ فَإِنَّ ذَلِكَ
دَاخِلٌ فِي الْبِدْعَةِ

The term *bid'ah* is used most often in relation to creed, and *kidhb* (lying) - though it is included in *fisq* – is considered separate due to its aspersion being more severe and extreme.

وَ أَكْثَرُ مَا يُسْتَعْمَلُ الْبِدْعَةُ فِي
الْإِعْتِقَادِ وَ الْكَذِبُ وَ إِنْ كَانَ
دَاخِلًا فِي الْفِسْقِ لَكِنَّهُمْ عَدُوُّهُ

أَصْلًاً عَلَى حِدَةٍ لِكَوْنِ الطَّعْنِ بِهِ
أَشَدُّ وَ أَغْلَظُ

4- *Jahālah* of a Narrator:

It is additionally a cause of aspersion in a ḥadīth for a narrator to be unknown (*jahālat al-rāwi*).

Since his name and identity are not known, therefore his condition [as a valid transmitter of ḥadīth] is also not known, as well as whether he is reliable or unreliable. [In such a situation, it is ambiguously said, for example]: “a man related to me” or “a *shaykh* informed me”.

Such a person who is mentioned with ambiguous wording is called *mubham*. The ḥadīth of the *mubham* is unacceptable unless he is a Companion, since all Companions are *‘ādil* (upright and possessing integrity).

If the narrator who is relating from a *mubham* relates words that indicate integrity, such as if he says “an upright person informed me” or “a reliable person related to me”, then there is a difference of opinion.

وَ أَمَّا جَهَالَةُ الرَّاوِي فَإِنَّهُ أَيْضًا
سَبَبٌ لِلْطَّعْنِ فِي الْحَدِيثِ لِأَنَّهُ لَمْ
يُعْرَفِ
اسْمُهُ وَ ذَاتُهُ لَمْ يُعْرَفْ حَالُهُ وَ أَنَّهُ
ثِقَةٌ أَوْ غَيْرُ ثِقَةٍ كَمَا يَقُولُ حَدَّثَنِي
رَجُلٌ وَ أَخْبَرَنِي شَيْخٌ

وَ هَذَا يُسَمِّي مُبْهَمًا وَ حَدِيثُ
الْمُبْهَمِ غَيْرُ مَقْبُولٍ إِلَّا أَنْ يَكُونَ
صَحَّابِيًّا لِأَنَّهُمْ عُدُولٌ

وَ إِنْ جَاءَ الْمُبْهَمُ بِلَفْظِ التَّعْدِيلِ
كَمَا يَقُولُ أَخْبَرَنِي عَدْلٌ أَوْ حَدَّثَنِي
ثِقَةٌ فَفِيهِ اخْتِلَافٌ

The sounder opinion is that such a ḥadīth should still not be accepted, because it is possible that the *mubham* is upright in the *mubhim*'s (obscurer) opinion but not in reality.

If a proficient *imam* says it, however, the ḥadīth should be accepted.

5- *Bid'ah* (Innovation):

Bid'ah is to believe in an innovation that opposes what is well-known in the religion and what has been related from the Messenger of Allah (may Allah bless him and grant him peace) and his Companions, based on a form of doubt and false interpretation, not by way of refusal and rejection, for that would be *kufr* (disbelief).

According to the majority of scholars, the ḥadīth of an innovator should be rejected.

وَ الْأَصَحُّ أَنَّهُ لَا يُقْبَلُ لِأَنَّهُ يَجُوزُ أَنْ يَكُونَ عَدْلًا فِي اعْتِقَادِهِ لَا فِي نَفْسِ

الْأَمْرِ

وَ إِنْ قَالَ ذَلِكَ إِمَامٌ حَادِقٌ قُبِلَ.

وَأَمَّا الْبِدْعَةُ فَالْمُرَادُ بِهِ اعْتِقَادُ أَمْرٍ

مُحْدَثٍ عَلَى خِلَافِ مَا عُرِفَ فِي

الدِّينِ وَ مَا جَاءَ مِنْ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ

صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَ سَلَّمَ وَ أَصْحَابِهِ

بِنَوْعِ شُبْهَةٍ وَ تَأْوِيلٍ لَا بِطَرِيقٍ

جُحْودٍ وَ إِنْكَارٍ فَإِنَّ ذَلِكَ كُفْرٌ

وَ حَدِيثُ الْمُبْتَدِعِ مَرْدُودٌ عِنْدَ

الْجُمْهُورِ

According to some scholars², however, if the innovator is [generally] characterized by truthfulness in speech and the preservation of his tongue [from lying], then his ḥadīth can be accepted.

Some scholars have stated that if the innovator denies a *mutawātir* (mass-transmitted) *shari‘ah* issue which is necessarily known to be a part of the religion, then he [and his ḥadīth] should be rejected.

If he is not of this description, however, then he can be accepted even if opponents declare him a disbeliever, [on the condition of] the presence of precision, scrupulousness, fear of Allah, caution, and preservation.

The preferred opinion, however, is that if he propagates his innovation and advertises it, then he shall be rejected.

If that is not the case, then he can be accepted, except if he narrates something that supports [and strengthens] his innovation, in which case the ḥadīth will definitely be rejected.

وَ عِنْدَ الْبَعْضِ إِنْ كَانَ مُتَصِّفًا
بِصِدْقِ الْلَّهْجَةِ وَ صِيَانَةِ الْلِّسَانِ

قُبْلَ
وَ قَالَ بَعْضُهُمْ إِنْ كَانَ مُنْكِرًا لِأَمْرٍ
مُتَوَاتِرٍ فِي الشَّرْعِ وَ قَدْ عُلِمَ
بِالضَّرُورَةِ كَوْنُهُ مِنَ الدِّينِ فَهُوَ
مَرْدُودٌ

وَ إِنْ لَمْ يَكُنْ بِهَذِهِ الصِّفَةِ يُقْبَلُ وَ
إِنْ كَفَرَهُ الْمُنَحَّالُفُونَ مَعَ وُجُودِ ضَبْطٍ
وَ وَرَعٍ وَ تَقْوَى وَ احْتِيَاطٍ وَ صِيَانَةٍ

وَ الْمُخْتَارُ أَنَّهُ إِنْ كَانَ دَاعِيًّا إِلَى
بِدْعَتِهِ وَ مُرَوِّجًا لَهُ رُدًّا

وَ إِنْ لَمْ يَكُنْ كَذَلِكَ قُبْلَ إِلَّا أَنْ
يَرُوِي شَيْئًا يُقَوِّي بِهِ بِدْعَتَهُ فَهُوَ
مَرْدُودٌ قَطْعًا

In summary, the *imams* differ in respect to accepting the ḥadīth of the people of *bid‘ah* and *ahwā’* (desires) and the people of deviated sects.

The author of *Jāmi‘ al-Usūl* said, “A group of imams of ḥadīth took from the Khawārij sect, Qadaris, Shī‘ites, Rāfiḍī Shī‘ites, and all the other people of innovation and desires.

Another group exercised caution and abstained from taking any ḥadīth from these sects, and each of them had their reasons.”

There is no doubt that taking ḥadīth from these sects is [permissible only] after investigation and acquisition of the truth.

وَ بِالْجُمْلَةِ الْأَئِمَّةُ مُخْتَلِفُونَ فِي أَنْحَذِ
الْحَدِيثِ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْبِدَعِ وَالْأَهْوَاءِ وَ
أَرْبَابِ الْمَذَاهِبِ الزَّائِغَةِ

وَ قَالَ صَاحِبُ جَامِعِ الْأَصُولِ أَنَّهُ
جَمَاعَةٌ مِنْ أَئِمَّةِ الْحَدِيثِ مِنْ فِرْقَةِ
الْخَوَارِجِ وَ الْمُنْتَسِبِينَ إِلَى الْقُدْرِ وَ
الشَّيْعَةِ وَ الرَّفَضِ وَ سَائِرِ أَصْحَابِ
الْبِدَعِ وَ الْأَهْوَاءِ

وَ قَدِ احْتَاطَ جَمَاعَةُ آخَرُونَ وَ
تَوَرَّعُوا مِنْ أَنْحَذِ حَدِيثَ مِنْ هَذِهِ
الْفِرَقِ وَ لِكُلِّ مِنْهُمْ نِيَاتٌ انتَهَى

وَ لَا شَكَّ أَنَّ أَنْحَذَ الْحَدِيثَ مِنْ
هَذِهِ الْفِرَقِ يَكُونُ بَعْدَ التَّحْرِي وَ
الْإِسْتِصْوَابِ

Even though precaution is not taking them since it has been established that these sects used to fabricate ḥadīth in order to promote their deviant opinions and would admit to it after repenting and recanting. And Allah knows best.

Causes of Aspersion Related to Accuracy:

The causes of aspersion related to accuracy are also five:

1. Excessive heedlessness (*farṭ al-ghaflah*)

2. Frequent error (*kathrat al-ghalat*)

3. Contradiction of the reliable narrators (*mukhālafat al-thiqāt*)

4. Delusion (*wahm*)

وَ مَعَ ذَلِكَ الْإِحْتِيَاطُ فِي عَدَمِ
الْأَخْذِ لِأَنَّهُ قَدْ ثَبَّتَ أَنَّ هُؤُلَاءِ
الْفِرَقَ كَانُوا يَضَعُونَ الْأَحَادِيثَ
لِتَرْوِيْجِ مَذَاهِبِهِمْ وَ كَانُوا يُقْرَرُونَ بِهِ
بَعْدَ التَّوْبَةِ وَ الرُّجُوعِ وَ اللَّهُ أَعْلَمُ.
فَصُلُّ

وَأَمَّا وُجُوهُ الطَّعْنِ الْمُتَعَلَّقَةُ بِالضَّبْطِ
فَهِيَ أَيْضًا خَمْسَةٌ

أَحَدُهَا فَرْطُ الْغَفْلَةِ

وَ ثَانِيَهَا كَثْرَةُ الْغَلَطِ

وَ ثَالِثُهَا مُخَالَفَةُ الشَّفَّاقَاتِ

وَ رَابِعُهَا الْوَهْمُ

5. Poor memory (*sū' al-hifz*)

وَ خَامِسُهَا سُوءُ الْحِفْظِ.

1,2- *Farṭ al-Ghaflah* (Excessive Heedlessness) and *Kathrat al-Ghalat* (Frequent Error):

Excessive heedlessness and frequent error are both close in meaning and import.

أَمَّا فَرْطُ الْغَفْلَةِ وَ كَثْرَةُ الْغَلَطِ
فَمُتَقَارِبَانِ

Heedlessness relates to hearing and retaining the ḥadīth, while error relates to narration and transmission.

فَالْعَفْلَةُ فِي السَّمَاعِ وَ تَحْمِلُ الْحَدِيثِ
وَ الْغَلَطُ فِي الْإِسْمَاعِ وَ الْأَدَاءِ

3- *Mukhālafat al-Thiqāt* (Contradiction of Reliable Narrators):

Contradiction of what the reliable narrators have related in the *sanad* or the *matn* can be of a variety of types. It necessitates anomaly (*shudhūdh*) and resultantly becomes a cause of aspersion in relation to accuracy.

وَ مُخَالَفَةُ الثَّقَاتِ فِي الْإِسْنَادِ أَوْ
الْمَتْنِ يَكُونُ عَلَى أَخْنَاءٍ مُتَعَدِّدَةٍ
تَكُونُ مُوجَبَةً لِلشُّدُوذِ

This is due to the fact that the cause of opposition to the reliable narrators is solely due to a lack of [or deficiency in] accuracy, memory, and the ability to protect the ḥadīth from change and alteration.

وَ جَعْلُهُ مِنْ وُجُوهِ الطَّعْنِ الْمُتَعَلَّقةِ
بِالضَّبْطِ مِنْ جِهَةِ أَنَّ الْبَاعِثَ عَلَى
مُخَالَفَةِ الثَّقَاتِ إِنَّمَا هُوَ عَدَمُ الضَّبْطِ

وَ الْحِفْظِ وَ عَدَمِ الصَّيَانَةِ عَنِ التَّعْيِيرِ
وَ التَّبَدِيلِ

4- *Wahm* (Delusion):

In regards to aspersion due to delusion (*wahm*) and forgetfulness (*nisyān*) by which [a narrator] falls into error in narration and therefore relates based upon his *wahm*,

If such aspersion can be discovered through proofs indicative of impairing defects and causes of rejection, then the ḥadīth will be *mu'allal* (defective).

This is the most obscure science of ḥadīth (difficult to comprehend) and also the most delicate.

Only those who have been granted true understanding, vast memory, and a complete knowledge of the status of narrators and the states of the chains and texts of ḥadīth, like the early predecessors (*mutaqaddimīn*) from amongst the masters of this science, can stand up to the task. They ended with Dāraqutnī and it is said that no equal ever succeeded him in this affair. And Allah knows best.

وَ الطَّعْنُ مِنْ جِهَةِ الْوَهْمِ وَ النُّسْيَانِ
الَّذِينَ أَخْطَأَهُمَا وَ رَوَى عَلَى
سَبِيلِ التَّوْهِمِ
إِنْ حَصَلَ الْإِطْلَاعُ عَلَى ذَلِكَ
بِقَرَائِنَ دَالِلَةٍ عَلَى وُجُوهٍ عِلَلٍ وَ
أَسْبَابٍ قَادِحَةٍ كَانَ الْحَدِيثُ مُعَلَّلًا

وَ هَذَا أَعْمَضُ عُلُومِ الْحَدِيثِ وَ
أَدْقَهَا
وَ لَا يَقُولُ بِهِ إِلَّا مَنْ رُزِقَ فَهْمًا وَ
حِفْظًا وَاسِعًا وَ مَعْرِفَةً تَامَّةً بِمَرَاتِبِ
الرُّوَاةِ وَ أَحْوَالِ الْأَسَانِيدِ وَ الْمُتُونِ
كَالْمُتَقَدِّمِينَ مِنْ أَرْبَابِ هَذَا الْفَنِّ
إِلَى أَنِ انْتَهَى إِلَى الدَّارِقُطْنِيِّ وَ يُقَالُ

لَمْ يَأْتِ بَعْدُهُ مِثْلُهُ فِي هَذَا الْأَمْرِ وَ
اللَّهُ أَعْلَمُ.

5- *Sū' al-Hifz* (Poor Memory):

[According to the scholars,] poor memory implies that a narrator's mistakes in transmission exceed his accuracy and that his heedless errors and forgetfulness exceed his memory and precision.

In other words, if errors and forgetfulness surmount or equal his accuracy and precision, he will be considered of poor memory.

What is necessary, therefore, is the predominance of a narrator's accuracy and precision.

وَ أَمَّا سُوءُ الْحِفْظِ فَقَالُوا إِنَّ الْمُرَادَ
بِهِ أَنْ لَا يَكُونَ إِصَابَتُهُ أَعْلَمَ عَلَى
خَطَايَا وَ حِفْظِهِ وَ إِتْقَانِهِ أَكْثَرَ مِنْ
سَهْوِهِ وَ نِسْيَانِهِ

يَعْنِي إِنْ كَانَ خَطَايَا وَ نِسْيَانُهُ
أَعْلَمَ أَوْ مُسَاوِيَا لِصَوَابِهِ وَ إِتْقَانِهِ
كَانَ دَاخِلًا فِي سُوءِ الْحِفْظِ

فَالْمُعْتَمَدُ عَلَيْهِ صَوَابُهُ وَ إِتْقَانُهُ
وَكَثْرَتُهُمَا

If poor memory characterizes a narrator at all times throughout his life, his ḥadīth will not be considered reliable.

وَ سُوءُ الْحِفْظِ إِنْ كَانَ لَازِمَ حَالِهِ فِي
جَمِيعِ الْأَوْقَاتِ وَ مُدَّةِ عُمُرِهِ لَا
يُعْتَبِرُ بِحَدِيثِهِ

According to some of the *muḥaddithīn* this type of ḥadīth will fall under the category of *shādhah*.

وَ عِنْدَ بَعْضِ الْمُحَدِّثِينَ هَذَا أَيْضًا
دَاخِلٌ فِي الشَّاذِ

If poor memory appears suddenly due to external circumstances, such as loss of retention due to senility and old age, loss of sight, or loss of one's books [of recorded ḥadīth], then such a person will be called a *mukhtalīt* (narrator affected by memory loss).

وَ إِنْ طَرَأَ سُوءُ الْحِفْظِ لِعَارِضٍ مِثْلِ
الْخَتْلَالِ فِي الْحَافِظَةِ بِسَبَبِ كِبِيرِ سِنِّهِ
أَوْ ذَهَابِ بَصَرِهِ أَوْ فَوَاتِ كُتُبِهِ فَهَذَا
يُسَمَّى مُخْتَلِطًا

What a narrator related before *ikhtilāt* (memory loss) and loss of retention will be accepted if it can be distinguished from what he related after this state. If it cannot be distinguished [from what was related after *ikhtilāt*] then [the scholars] refrain from ruling on the ḥadīth. Likewise will be the case if [the situation] is vague.

فَمَا رَوَى قَبْلَ الْإِخْتِلَالِ وَ
الْإِخْتِلَالِ مُتَمَيِّزًا عَمَّا رَوَاهُ بَعْدَ هَذِهِ
الْحَالِ قُبْلَ وَ إِنْ لَمْ يَتَمَيِّزْ تَوْقُفُ وَ
إِنْ اشْتَبَهَ فَكَذِلِكَ

If corroborative ḥadīth (*mutābi‘āt*) and attestations (*shawāhid*) exist for this type of ḥadīth, it will improve from the status of rejection to acceptance and preference.

This is also the ruling for the ḥadīths of the *mastūr* (concealed), *mudallis* (misrepresenter), and *mursil* (omitter) narrators.

وَ إِنْ وُجِدَ هَذَا الْقِسْمِ مُتَابِعَاتٌ وَ شَوَّاهِدٌ تَرَقَى مِنْ مَرْتَبَةِ الرَّدِّ إِلَى الْقَبُولِ وَ الرُّجْحَانِ
وَ هَذَا حُكْمُ أَحَادِيثِ الْمَسْتُورِ وَ الْمُدَلِّسِ وَ الْمُرْسَلِ.

فَصْلٌ

Chapter Six: *Gharīb*, *‘Azīz*, *Mashhūr*, and *Mutawātir* Ḥadīth

***Gharīb*, *‘Azīz*, *Mashhūr*, and *Mutawātir* (Rare, Scarce, Well-Known, and Mass-Transmitted Hadīth):**

If a *sahīh* ḥadīth is being transmitted by a single narrator [at any level of the chain] it is termed *gharīb*.

الْحَدِيثُ الصَّحِيفُ إِنْ كَانَ رَاوِيهٌ
وَاحِدًا يُسَمَّى غَرِيبًا

If the narrators are [a minimum of] two [at any level of the chain, the ḥadīth] is termed *‘azīz*.

وَ إِنْ كَانَ اثْنَيْنِ يُسَمَّى عَزِيزًا

If the narrators are more than [two at each level of the chain, the ḥadīth] is termed *mashhūr* or *mustafīd* (well-circulated).

وَ إِنْ كَانُوا لَأَكْثَرَ يُسَمَّى مَشْهُورًا وَ مُسْتَفِيدًا

If the narrators of a ḥadīth reach such abundance [at each level of the chain] that it is deemed impossible for them to have collectively conspired upon a lie the ḥadīth is termed *mutawātir*.

وَ إِنْ بَلَغَتْ رُوَاْتُهُ فِي الْكَثْرَةِ إِلَى أَنْ
يَسْتَحِيلَ الْعَادَةُ تَوَاطُّعُهُمْ عَلَى
الْكَذِبِ يُسَمَّى مُتَوَاتِرًا

Fard (Unique ḥadīth):
The *gharīb* (rare) ḥadīth is also called *fard*.

وَ يُسَمَّى الْغَرِيبُ فَرْدًا أَيْضًا

What is meant by the narrator being unique is that he is alone at any particular level of the chain [and not necessarily that uniqueness exists at every level of the chain]. Such a ḥadīth is [more specifically] called *fard nisbī* (relatively-unique).

وَ الْمُرَادُ بِكُوْنِ رَاوِيهٍ وَاحِدًا كَوْنُهُ
كَذِلِكَ وَ لَوْ فِي مَوْضِعٍ وَاحِدٍ مِنَ
الإِسْنَادِ لَكِنَّهُ يُسَمَّى فَرْدًا نِسْبِيًّا

If the singularity (uniqueness) exists at every level of the chain, the ḥadīth is called *fard muṭlaq* (absolutely-unique).

وَ إِنْ كَانَ فِي كُلِّ مَوْضِعٍ مِنْهُ يُسَمَّى
فَرْدًا مُطْلَقًا

What is meant by narrators being two (and therefore the ḥadīth being 'azīz) is that there are at least two narrators at every level [of the chain].

وَ الْمُرَادُ بِكُوْنِهِمَا اثْنَيْنِ أَنْ يَكُونَا فِي
كُلِّ مَوْضِعٍ كَذِلِكَ

If there is only a single narrator at any level [of the chain], for example, then the ḥadīth will not be 'azīz but *gharīb*.

فَإِنْ كَانَ فِي مَوْضِعٍ وَاحِدٍ مَثَلًا لَمْ
يَكُنِ الْحَدِيثُ عَزِيزًا بَلْ غَرِيبًا

Based upon this principle, the meaning of considering abundance in a *mashhūr* ḥadīth is that there should be more than two narrators at every level [of the chain]. This is the intent behind the statement: “The minority governs the majority in this science”.² So understand.

***Gharābah* (Rarity) and *Ṣihhah* (Soundness):**

It should be known from the aforementioned that rarity (*gharābah*) does not necessarily contradict soundness (*ṣihhah*). It is possible for a ḥadīth to be both sound (*sahīh*) and rare (*gharīb*) if all of the individual narrators of the ḥadīth are reliable.

وَ عَلَى هَذَا الْقِيَامِ مَعْنَى اعْتِبَارِ
الْكَثُرَةِ فِي الْمَشْهُورِ أَنْ يَكُونَ فِي
كُلِّ مَوْضِعٍ أَكْثَرَ مِنْ اثْنَيْنِ وَ هَذَا
مَعْنَى قَوْلِهِمْ إِنَّ الْأَقْلَلَ حَاكِمٌ عَلَى
الْأَكْثَرِ فِي هَذَا الْفَنِ فَافْهَمُوهُمْ

وَ عُلِمَ مِمَّا ذُكِرَ أَنَّ الْغَرَابَةَ لَا تُنَافِي
الصَّحَّةَ وَ يَجُوَزُ أَنْ يَكُونَ الْحَدِيثُ
صَحِيحًا غَرِيبًا بِأَنْ يَكُونَ كُلُّ وَاحِدٍ
مِنْ رِجَالِهِ ثِقَةً

When *Gharīb* Implies *Shādhdh*:

The term *gharīb*, however, is occasionally used to mean *shādhdh* (anomalous) – anomaly – and therefore is a type of aspersion in a ḥadīth. This is what the author of *al-Maṣābiḥ* means when he says, “this ḥadīth is *gharīb* (anomalous),” which he mentions by way of criticism.

وَ الْغَرِيبُ قَدْ يَقْعُدُ بِمَعْنَى الشَّاذِ أَيْ
شُدُودًا هُوَ مِنْ أَقْسَامِ الطَّعْنِ فِي
الْحَدِيثِ وَ هَذَا هُوَ الْمُرَادُ مِنْ قَوْلِ
صَاحِبِ الْمَصَابِيحِ مِنْ قَوْلِهِ هَذَا
حَدِيثٌ غَرِيبٌ لِمَا قَالَ بِطَرِيقِ
الْطَّعْنِ

Some scholars explain that the term *shādhdh* [simply indicates] singularity of the narrator without taking into consideration his opposition to [other] reliable narrators, as has been defined previously.

They therefore [oftentimes] state that a “ḥadīth is *sahīh* (sound) and *shādhdh* (rare)” or that a “ḥadīth is *sahīh* (sound) and not *shādhdh* (rare)”.

According to this meaning then, being *shādhdh*, like rarity (*gharābah*), will not contradict soundness (*siḥḥah*). Only when the term is used in the context of aspersion (criticism) will it indicate a ḥadīth that opposes [what was reported by] reliable narrators.

Chapter Seven: The Levels of Weak, Sound and Other ḥadīth, and Some Terminology Particular to Imam Tirmidhī

Da’if (Weak ḥadīth):

A *da’if* ḥadīth is a ḥadīth in which the considered conditions of soundness and fairness are completely or partially absent and whose narrator(s) have been criticized due to an anomaly (*shudhūd*), disclaim (*nakārah*), or impairing defect (*illah*).¹

وَ بَعْضُ النَّاسِ يُقَسِّرُونَ الشَّاذَ بِمُعَرَّدٍ
الرَّاوِي مِنْ غَيْرِ اعْتِبَارٍ مُخَالَفَتِهِ
لِلثَّقَاتِ كَمَا سَبَقَ
وَ يَقُولُونَ صَحِيحٌ شَاذٌ وَ صَحِيحٌ
غَيْرُ شَاذٌ
فَالشُّذُوذُ بِهَذَا الْمَعْنَى أَيْضًا لَا يُنَافِي
الصَّحَّةَ كَالْغَرَابَةِ وَ الَّذِي يُذَكَّرُ فِي
مَقَامِ الطَّعْنِ هُوَ مُخَالِفٌ لِلثَّقَاتِ.

فَصْلٌ

الْحَدِيثُ الْضَّعِيفُ هُوَ الَّذِي فُقِدَ
فِيهِ الشَّرَائِطُ الْمُعْتَبَرَةُ فِي الصَّحَّةِ وَ
الْحُسْنِ كُلَّاً أَوْ بَعْضًا وَ يُذَمُّ رَاوِيهِ
بِشُذُوذٍ أَوْ نَكَارَةٍ أَوْ عِلَّةٍ

According to this understanding, the categories of *da’if* ḥadīth are numerous and are abundant both independently and compounded [due to the presence and absence of the conditions of soundness].²

Levels of *Ṣaḥīḥ* and *Ḥasan* ḥadīth:

The varying levels of the *ṣaḥīḥ* and *ḥasan* ḥadīth, both in-itself and through-corroboration, are in accordance with the varying levels and ranks in perfection of the qualities taken into consideration in understanding [the *ṣaḥīḥ* and *ḥasan* ḥadīth] while obviously comprising the fundamental characteristics of being *ṣaḥīḥ* and *ḥasan*.³

[Scholars of ḥadīth and Islamic jurisprudence] have precisely delineated and defined the levels of *ṣihhah* (soundness). They have mentioned examples of chains and said regarding them: “Although integrity and accuracy are found in the narrators of [all] the chains, some of the chains are superior to others.”

وَ بِهَذَا الِاعْتِبَارِ يَتَعَدَّدُ أَقْسَامُ
الضَّعِيفِ وَ يَكُثُرُ أَفْرَادًا وَ تَرْكِيبًا

وَ مَرَاتِبُ الصَّحِيحِ وَ الْحَسَنِ
لِذَاتِهِمَا وَ لِغَيْرِهِمَا أَيْضًا بِتَفَاقُتِ
الْمَرَاتِبِ وَ الدَّرَجَاتِ فِي كَمَالِ
الصَّفَاتِ الْمُعْتَبَرَةِ الْمَأْخُوذَةِ فِي
مَفْهُومِهِمَا مَعَ وُجُودِ الِإِسْتِرَالِ فِي
أَصْلِ الصَّحَّةِ وَ الْحَسَنِ

وَ الْقَوْمُ ضَبَطُوا مَرَاتِبَ الصَّحَّةِ وَ
عَيْنُوهَا وَ ذَكَرُوا أَمْثِلَتَهَا مِنَ
الْأَسَانِيدِ وَ قَالُوا اسْمُ الْعَدَالَةِ وَ
الضَّبْطِ يَشْمُلُ رِجَالَهَا كُلَّهَا وَ لَكِنَّ
بَعْضَهَا فَوْقَ بَعْضٍ

The Soundest Chain:

A difference of opinion exists regarding the consideration of a specific chain as being the most *sahīh* and authentic of all chains.

Some scholars claimed that the most authentic chain is: "Zayn al-Ābidīn from his father from his grandfather."

It is also said that the most authentic chain is: "Mālik from Nāfi' from Ibn 'Umar."

It is also said that the most authentic chain is: "Zuhrī from Sālim on the authority Ibn 'Umar."

In truth, it is not permissible to declare any specific chain as conclusively the soundest of all chains. Nevertheless, there are highest categories of soundness and a number of chains fall into these categories.

وَ أَمَّا إِطْلَاقُ أَصَحٍ الْأَسَانِيدِ عَلَى
سَنَدٍ مُخْصُوصٍ عَلَى الإِطْلَاقِ فَفِيهِ
اِخْتِلَافٌ

فَقَالَ بَعْضُهُمْ أَصَحٌ الْأَسَانِيدِ زَيْنُ
الْعَابِدِيْنَ عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَنْ جَدِّهِ

وَ قِيلَ مَالِكٌ عَنْ نَافِعٍ عَنْ ابْنِ عُمَرَ

وَ قِيلَ الرُّهْرِيُّ عَنْ سَالِمٍ عَنْ ابْنِ
عُمَرَ

وَ الْحَقُّ أَنَّ الْحُكْمَ عَلَى إِسْنَادٍ
مُخْصُوصٍ بِالْأَصْحَىِّ عَلَى الإِطْلَاقِ
غَيْرُ جَائزٍ إِلَّا أَنَّ فِي الصِّحَّةِ مَرَاتِبٌ
عُلَيْهَا وَ عِدَّهُ مِنَ الْأَسَانِيدِ يَدْخُلُ
فِيهَا

If [judgment] is restricted to stating that a chain is the most sound chain of such and such city or in such and such chapter of ḥadīth or on such and such a topic, it will be valid. And Allah knows best.

وَلَوْ فُسِّدَ بِقَيْدٍ بِأَنْ يُقَالُ أَصَحُّ
أَسَانِيدُ الْبَلْدِ الْفُلَانِيُّ أَوْ فِي الْبَابِ
الْفُلَانِيُّ أَوْ فِي الْمَسْأَلَةِ الْفُلَانِيَّةِ
يَصِحُّ وَاللَّهُ أَعْلَمُ.

Some Unique Terminology of Imam Tirmidhī:

It is the habit of Tirmidhī in his *Jami'* [al-Tirmidhī]² to state: “[this is] a *ḥasan*, *ṣahīh* ḥadīth,” “[this is] a *gharīb*, *ḥasan* ḥadīth”, or “[this is] a *ḥasan*, *gharīb*, *ṣahīh* ḥadīth”.

فَصْلٌ

مِنْ عَادَةِ التَّرْمِذِيِّ أَنْ يَقُولَ فِي
جَامِعِهِ حَدِيثُ حَسَنٌ صَحِيحٌ،
حَدِيثُ غَرِيبٌ حَسَنٌ، حَدِيثُ
حَسَنٌ غَرِيبٌ صَحِيحٌ

There can be no doubt about the possibility of combining fairness (*husn*) and soundness (*sihhah*) in that a ḥadīth can be *ḥasan li dhātihi* (*ḥasan-in-itself*) but also *ṣahīh li ghayrihi* (*ṣahīh-through-corroboration*).

وَلَا شُبُهَةٌ فِي جَوَازِ اجْتِمَاعِ الْحُسْنِ
وَالصَّحَّةِ بِأَنْ يَكُونَ حَسَنًا لِذَاتِهِ وَ
صَحِيحًا لِغَيْرِهِ

Similarly, it is possible to combine *gharābah* (rarity) and *sihhah* (soundness), as we have mentioned previously.

وَكَذَلِكَ فِي اجْتِمَاعِ الْغَرَابَةِ وَ
الصَّحَّةِ كَمَا أَسْلَفْنَا

As for the combination of *gharābah* (rarity) and *husn* (fairness), the scholars have deemed [this term usage] as problematic and vague, since Tirmidhī considered fairness (*husn*) to be [contingent on] the multiplicity of paths of transmission, which would bring into question how the ḥadīth could [also] be rare (*gharīb*).

[The scholars] respond by stating that considering numerous paths of transmission as a condition for the *hasan* ḥadīth is not an absolute rule; rather it is simply a type of [*hasan* ḥadīth].

When the declaration [of Imam Tirmidhī] upon a ḥadīth combines both fairness and rarity, then the definition of the term *hasan* is of a different type of *hasan*.

Other scholars stated that [the intent of the statement is that Imam Tirmidhī] is simply pointing out the difference in paths of transmission, that in some paths of transmission it is rare (i.e. *gharīb* and *hasan* together) and in some it is not rare (just *hasan*).

It has also been said that [when Tirmidhī uses the particle *wāw* (usually meaning “and”) here, he] implies the meaning “or” and that [Tirmidhī], due to lack of absolute certainty in knowledge, is doubtful [of the status of the ḥadīth] and is therefore hesitant about whether the report is *gharīb* or *hasan*.

وَ أَمَّا اجْتِمَاعُ الْغَرَابَةِ وَ الْحُسْنِ
فَيَسْتَشْكِلُونَهُ بِأَنَّ التَّرْمِذِيَّ اعْتَبَرَ فِي
الْحُسْنِ تَعْدُدَ الْطُّرُقِ فَكَيْفَ يَكُونُ
غَرِيبًا

وَ يُجْبِيُونَ بِأَنَّ اعْتِبَارَ تَعْدُدِ الْطُّرُقِ
فِي الْحُسْنِ لَيْسَ عَلَى الْإِطْلَاقِ بَلْ
فِي قِسْمٍ مِّنْهُ
وَ حِينَ حَكَمَ بِاجْتِمَاعِ الْحُسْنِ وَ
الْغَرَابَةِ الْمُرَادُ قِسْمٌ آخَرُ

وَ قَالَ بَعْضُهُمْ أَنَّهُ أَشَارَ بِذَلِكَ إِلَى
اخْتِلَافِ الْطُّرُقِ بِأَنْ جَاءَ فِي بَعْضِ
الْطُّرُقِ غَرِيبًا وَ فِي بَعْضِهَا حَسَنًا

وَ قِيلَ الْوَao بِمَعْنَى أَوْ بِأَنَّهُ يَشْكُّ وَ
يَتَرَدَّدُ فِي أَنَّهُ غَرِيبٌ أَوْ حَسَنٌ لِغَيْرِ
مَعْرِفَتِهِ جَزْمًا

It is also said that the meaning of *hasan* here is not the technical meaning but the lexical one, implying “that which one’s intrinsic nature inclines towards”. This opinion, however, is very farfetched.

¹

وَ قِيلَ الْمُرَادُ بِالْحَسَنِ هَهُنَا لَيْسَ
مَعْنَاهُ الْإِصْطَلَاحِي بَلِ الْلُّغَوِيِّ بِمَعْنَى
مَا يَمِيلُ إِلَيْهِ الظَّهْرُ وَ هَذَا الْقُولُ
بَعِيدٌ جِدًّا.

Chapter Eight: Legal Argumentation Using *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Hasan*, and *Da’if* Ḥadīth

فصل

Legal Argumentation (Derivation of Rulings) Using *Ṣaḥīḥ* and *Hasan* Ḥadīth:
[The permissibility of] deriving proofs for legal rulings (legal argumentation) from sound ḥadīth is unanimously agreed upon,

as is [deriving proofs] from *hasan* ḥadīth according to the majority of the scholars.

[The *hasan* ḥadīth] is appended to the *ṣaḥīḥ* ḥadīth in respect to the permissibility of deriving proofs from it although lesser than the [*ṣaḥīḥ* ḥadīth] in status.

Additionally, a *da’if* ḥadīth which reaches the level of *hasan*-through-corroboration (*hasan li ghayrihi*) due to its numerous paths of transmission is also unanimously agreed upon [as permissible for legal argumentation].

الإِحْتِجَاجُ فِي الْأَحْكَامِ بِالْحَبْرِ
الصَّحِيحِ مُجْمَعٌ عَلَيْهِ
وَ كَذَلِكَ بِالْحَسَنِ لِذَاتِهِ عِنْدَ عَامَّةِ
الْعُلَمَاءِ

وَ هُوَ مُلْحَقٌ بِالصَّحِيحِ فِي بَابِ
الإِحْتِجَاجِ وَ إِنْ كَانَ دُونَهُ فِي
الْمَرْتَبَةِ

وَ الْحَدِيثُ الْضَّعِيفُ الَّذِي بَلَغَ
يَتَعَدُّدُ الْطُّرُقُ مَرْتَبَةُ الْحَسَنِ لِغَيْرِهِ
أَيْضًا مُجْمَعٌ

Legal Argumentation Using *Da’if* Ḥadīth:

The popular understanding that a *da’if* ḥadīth is reliable in respect to the virtues of actions (*faḍā’il al-a’māl*) refers to individually *da’if* ḥadīth (*da’if* ḥadīth that have no corroboration) and not the combination of *da’if* ḥadīth, since they will be considered to be in the category of *ḥasan* ḥadīth (due to corroboration) and not *da’if* ḥadīth as the imams of ḥadīth have clarified.

Some scholars have said that if a *da’if* ḥadīth is weak due to poor memory, confusion (*ikhtilāṭ*), or misrepresentation (*tadlīs*), despite the presence of honesty and reliability, then the ḥadīth can be reinforced by the corroboration of numerous paths of transmission (otherwise the ḥadīth will be too weak to accept corroboration).

If the weakness is due to suspicion of lying (*ittihām bi ‘l-kidhb*), anomaly (*shudhūdh*), or excessive mistakes (*fahsh al-ghalat*) however, the report cannot be reinforced by the presence of numerous paths of transmission and it will be therefore judged as *da’if*, though it can be practiced upon in respect to the virtues of actions. ²

وَ مَا اشْتَهِرَ أَنَّ الْحَدِيثَ الْضَّعِيفَ
مُعْتَبِرٌ فِي فَضَائِلِ الْأَعْمَالِ لَا فِي
غِيرِهَا الْمُرَادُ مُفْرَدًا لَا مَجْمُوعُهَا
لَا نَهُ دَاخِلٌ فِي الْحَسَنِ لَا فِي
الْضَّعِيفِ صَرَّحَ بِهِ الْأَئِمَّةُ

وَ قَالَ بَعْضُهُمْ إِنْ كَانَ الْضَّعِيفُ
مِنْ جِهَةِ سُوءِ حَفْظٍ أَوْ اخْتِلَاطٍ أَوْ
تَدْلِيسٍ مَعَ وُجُودِ الصَّدْقِ وَ الدَّيَانَةِ
يَنْجِبُ بِتَعَدُّدِ الْطُّرُقِ
وَ إِنْ كَانَ مِنْ جِهَةِ اتِّهَامِ الْكَذِبِ
أَوِ الشُّدُوذِ أَوْ فُحْشِ الْخَطَاةِ لَا
يَنْجِبُ بِتَعَدُّدِ الْطُّرُقِ وَ الْحَدِيثُ
مَحْكُومٌ عَلَيْهِ بِالضَّعْفِ وَ مَعْمُولٌ بِهِ
فِي فَضَائِلِ الْأَعْمَالِ

Based on this consideration should the statement “the appendage of a *da’if* report to a *da’if* report does not provide reinforcement” be understood. Otherwise, this statement is clearly incorrect, so reflect.¹

وَ عَلَى مِثْلِ هَذَا يَنْبَغِي أَنْ يُحْمَلَ مَا قِيلَ أَنَّ لُحُوقَ الْضَّعِيفِ بِالْضَّعِيفِ لَا يُفَيِّدُ قُوَّةً وَ إِلَّا فَهَذَا الْقَوْلُ ظَاهِرٌ الْفَسَادِ فَتَدَبَّرْ.

فَصْلٌ

Chapter Nine: The Ranks, Number, and Collections of *Ṣaḥīḥ* Ḥadīth

Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī:

Once it has been established that] the *ṣaḥīḥ* ḥadīth vary in rank and status and that some *ṣaḥīḥ* ḥadīth are sounder than others,

it should also be known that it has been established amongst the majority of traditionists (*muḥaddithīn*) that the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Bukhārī is foremost in rank amongst all other compilations of *ḥadīth* to the extent that they have said that the most *ṣaḥīḥ* book after the Book of Allah is the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Bukhārī.²

لَمَّا تَفَاوَتَتْ مَرَاتِبُ الصَّحِّحِ وَ الصَّحَّاحُ بَعْضُهَا أَصَحُّ مِنْ بَعْضٍ فَاعْلَمْ أَنَّ الَّذِي تَقَرَّرَ عِنْدَ جُمْهُورِ الْمُحَدِّثِينَ أَنَّ صَحِّحَ الْبُخَارِيَّ مُقَدَّمٌ عَلَى سَائِرِ الْكُتُبِ الْمُصَنَّفَةِ حَتَّىٰ قَالُوا أَصَحُّ الْكُتُبِ بَعْدَ كِتَابِ اللَّهِ صَحِّحَ الْبُخَارِيَّ

وَ بَعْضُ الْمَعَارِبِ رَجَحُوا صَحِّحَ مُسْلِمٍ عَلَى صَحِّحِ الْبُخَارِيَّ

Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim:

Some scholars of the Western Islamic world (Al-Maghrib, which consisted of Andalusia and West Africa) gave preference to the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim over the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Bukhārī.³

The majority of scholars, however, state that this [preference] referred to the excellence of [Muslim's] elucidation, placement, and arrangement, as well as the care taken by him to indicate and comment on fine points within the chains.

وَ الْجُمْهُورُ يَقُولُونَ إِنَّ هَذَا فِيمَا
يَرْجِعُ إِلَى حُسْنِ الْبَيَانِ وَ جَوْدَةِ
الْوَضْعِ وَ التَّرْتِيبِ وَ رِعَايَةِ دَقَائِقِ
الإِشَارَاتِ وَ مَحَاسِنِ النَّكَاتِ فِي
الْأَسَانِيدِ

These [considerations, however,] are off topic, since the discussion is on authenticity and strength and those factors related to them.

وَ هَذَا خَارِجٌ عَنِ الْمَبْحَثِ وَ
الْكَلَامُ فِي الصَّحَّةِ وَ الْفُوْرَةِ وَ مَا
يَتَعَلَّقُ بِهِمَا

And truly no book can equal the *Sahīh* of *Bukhārī* in this respect. The thorough realization of all the characteristics required for the soundness of its narrators attests to this.

وَ لَيْسَ كِتَابٌ يُسَاوِيْ صَحِيحَ
الْبُخَارِيِّ فِي هَذَا الْبَابِ بِدَلِيلٍ كَمَالِ
الصَّفَاتِ الَّتِي اعْتَرَرْتُ فِي الصَّحَّةِ فِي
رِجَالِهِ

Some scholars hesitated to give preference to one over the other⁴, but the truth lies with the first opinion.

وَ بَعْضُهُمْ تَوَقَّفَ فِي تَرْجِيحِ أَحَدِهِمَا
عَلَى الْآخَرِ وَالْحَقُّ هُوَ الْأَوَّلُ

Muttafaq 'Alayhi (Agreed-Upon Ḥadīth):

A report that is narrated by both *Bukhārī* and *Muslim* [in their *Sahīhs*] is termed *muttafaq 'alayhi*.

Shaykh [Ibn Ḥajar al-Asqalānī additionally] stated that the condition [for a ḥadīth to be considered agreed upon] is that it should be narrated from the same Companion.¹

[Scholars] have stated that the total amount of agreed-upon ḥadīth is two thousand three hundred and twenty-six (2,326).²

Ranks of the *Sahīh* Ḥadīth:

Generally, preference is given to [a ḥadīth] that:

1. The two *Shaykhs* (*Bukhārī* and *Muslim*) agree upon over other [ḥadīth]
2. Then to what *Bukhārī* alone narrates
3. Then to what *Muslim* alone narrates
4. Then to a ḥadīth that meets the conditions of *Bukhārī* and *Muslim*

وَ الْحَدِيثُ الَّذِي اتَّفَقَ الْبُخَارِيُّ وَ
مُسْلِمٌ عَلَى تَحْرِيْجِهِ يُسَمَّى مُتَّفَقًا
عَلَيْهِ

وَ قَالَ الشَّيْخُ بِشَرْطٍ أَنْ يَكُونَ عَنْ
صَحَّاْيِيْ وَاحِدٍ

وَ قَالُوا بِمَحْمُوعِ الْأَحَادِيْثِ الْمُتَّفَقَةِ
عَلَيْهَا أَلْفَانٌ وَ ثَلَاثِيَّمَائَةٌ وَ سِتَّةٌ وَ
عِشْرُونَ

وَ بِالْجُمْلَةِ مَا اتَّفَقَ عَلَيْهِ الشَّيْخَانِ
مُقَدَّمٌ عَلَى غَيْرِهِ
مُثُمَّ مَا تَفَرَّدَ بِهِ الْبُخَارِيُّ
مُثُمَّ مَا تَفَرَّدَ بِهِ مُسْلِمٌ مُثُمَّ مَا كَانَ
عَلَى شَرْطِ الْبُخَارِيِّ وَ مُسْلِمٍ

5. Then to a ḥadīth that meets the conditions of Bukhārī

6. Then to a ḥadīth that meets to conditions of Muslim

7. Then to a ḥadīth that has been narrated by other Imams who have adhered to [the accepted conditions of] soundness (*ṣihhah*) and have declared the ḥadīth to be *sahīh*.¹

There are therefore a total of seven categories.²

Meaning of the Phrase: “The Conditions of Bukhārī and Muslim”:

What is meant by [the phrase] “the conditions of Bukhārī and Muslim” is that the narrators of a ḥadīth should be characterized by the attributes that the narrators of Bukhārī and Muslim are characterized with, including accuracy, integrity, and the absence of anomaly, unfamiliarity, and heedlessness.

Some say that the intent of the phrase “the conditions of Bukhārī and Muslim” is the narrators [of Bukhārī and Muslim] themselves. This is, in fact, a long discussion which I have mentioned in the introduction to *Sharḥ Sifr al-Sa‘ādah* (A Commentary on the Book of Bliss).⁴

ئِمَّ مَا هُوَ عَلَى شَرْطِ الْبُخَارِيِّ

ئِمَّ مَا هُوَ عَلَى شَرْطِ مُسْلِمٍ

ئِمَّ مَا هُوَ رَوَاهُ مِنْ غَيْرِهِمْ مِنَ الْأَئِمَّةِ

الَّذِينَ التَّزَمُوا الصِّحَّةَ وَ صَحَّحُوهُ

فَالْأَقْسَامُ سَبْعَةٌ

وَ الْمُرَادُ بِشَرْطِ الْبُخَارِيِّ وَ مُسْلِمٍ

أَنْ يَكُونَ الرِّجَالُ مُتَصِّفِينَ

بِالصِّفَاتِ الَّتِي يَتَصِّفُ بِهَا رِجَالُ

الْبُخَارِيِّ وَ مُسْلِمٍ مِنَ الضَّبْطِ وَ

الْعَدَالَةِ وَ عَدَمِ الشُّذُوذِ وَ النَّكَارَةِ وَ

الْغُفْلَةِ

وَ قِيلَ الْمُرَادُ بِشَرْطِ الْبُخَارِيِّ وَ

مُسْلِمٍ رِجَالُهُمَا أَنفُسُهُمْ وَ الْكَلَامُ

فِي هَذَا طَوِيلٌ ذَكْرُنَاهُ فِي مُقَدَّمَةِ

شَرْحِ سِفْرِ السَّعَادَةِ.

**Imams Bukhārī and Muslim and
Encompassing *Ṣaḥīḥ* Ḥadīth:**

Ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth are not exclusive to *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. [Bukhārī and Muslim] did not encompass all the existing *ṣaḥīḥ* ḥadīth although their books are exclusive to *ṣaḥīḥ* ḥadīth.

In fact, they did not even include in their books all the ḥadīth that they possessed nor that met their conditions, besides those ḥadīth that others possessed.

فَصْلٌ

الْأَحَادِيثُ الصَّحِيحَةُ لَمْ تَنْحَصِرْ فِي
صَحِيحِ الْبُخَارِيِّ وَ مُسْلِمٍ وَ لَمْ
يَسْتَوْعِبَا الصَّحَاحَ كُلُّهَا بَلْ هُمَا
مُنْحَصِرَانِ فِي الصَّحَاحِ
وَ الصَّحَاحُ الَّتِي عِنْدَهُمَا وَ عَلَى
شَرْطِهِمَا أَيْضًا لَمْ يُورِدَا هُمَا فِي
كِتَابِيهِمَا فَضْلًا عَمَّا عِنْدَ غَيْرِهِمَا

قَالَ الْبُخَارِيُّ مَا أُورَدْتُ فِي كِتَابِيِّ
هَذَا إِلَّا مَا صَحَّ وَ لَقَدْ تَرْكْتُ كَثِيرًا
مِنَ الصَّحَاحِ

Bukhārī said: “I have not related in my book except that which is *ṣaḥīḥ*, and I have certainly left out many *ṣaḥīḥ* ḥadīth.”⁵

Muslim said: “The ḥadīth that I have related in this book are *sahīh*, but I do not say that what I have left out is weak.”⁶

وَ قَالَ مُسْلِمُ الَّذِي أَوْرَدْتُ فِي هَذَا الْكِتَابِ مِنَ الْأَحَادِيثِ صَحِيفٌ وَ لَا أَقُولُ مَا تَرَكْتُ ضَعِيفٌ

[It can be assumed that] there must be a specific reason for their exclusion or mention of a ḥadīth, either due to soundness or due to various other reasons.

وَ لَا بُدَّ أَنْ يَكُونَ فِي هَذَا التَّرْكِ وَ الْإِتْيَانِ وَجْهٌ تَخْصِيصٌ لِلْإِيْرَادِ وَ التَّرْكِ إِمَّا مِنْ جَهَةِ الصَّحَّةِ أَوْ مَقَاصِدَ أُخْرَى

Al-Ḥākim Abū ‘Abdullāh al-Nīsābūrī authored a book which he named *al-Mustadrak* (the Emendation)¹, implying that he mentioned in the book the *sahīh* ḥadīth that were left out by Bukhārī and Muslim. He [attempted to] correct and amend [the two *Sahīhs* by mentioning ḥadīth that had not been mentioned in them].

وَ الْحَاكِمُ أَبُو عَبْدِ اللَّهِ النِّيْسَابُورِيُّ صَنَّفَ كِتَابًا سَمَّاهُ الْمُسْتَدْرَكَ بِمَعْنَى أَنَّ مَا تَرَكَهُ الْبُخَارِيُّ وَ مُسْلِمٌ مِنَ الصَّحَّاحِ أَوْرَدَهُ فِي هَذَا الْكِتَابِ

Some of the [amended ḥadīth] were in accordance with the conditions of [Imam] Bukhārī, some were in accordance with the conditions of [Imam] Muslim, and others were not in accordance with the conditions of either.

وَ تَلَأَ فِي وَ اسْتَدْرَكَ بَعْضُهَا عَلَى شَرْطِ الشَّيْخَيْنِ وَ بَعْضُهَا عَلَى شَرْطِ أَحَدِهِمَا وَ بَعْضُهَا عَلَى غَيْرِ شَرْطِهِمَا

He states, “Bukhārī and Muslim have not ruled that there are no *sahīh* ḥadīth other than what they have mentioned in their two books.”

He [also] stated that: “a sect of innovators has appeared in our times that has slandered the *Imāms* of the religion (*dīn*) by saying that the collective amount of ḥadīth that are considered *sahīh* by them do not reach even some ten thousand.”

It has been transmitted from Bukhārī that he said: “I have memorized one hundred thousand of the *sahīh* ḥadīth and two hundred thousand of the non-*sahīh* ḥadīth.” Apparently, and Allah knows best, he meant “*sahīh*” according to his own conditions.

وَ قَالَ إِنَّ الْبُخَارِيَّ وَ مُسْلِمًا لَمْ
يَحْكُمَا بِأَنَّهُ لَيْسَ أَحَادِيثُ صَحِيحَةٌ
غَيْرَ مَا أَخْرَجَاهُ فِي هَذَيْنِ الْكِتَابَيْنِ

وَ قَالَ قَدْ حَدَثَ فِي عَصْرِنَا هَذَا
فِرْقَةٌ مِنَ الْمُبْتَدِعِينَ أَطَالُوا أَسْنَتَهُمْ
بِالطَّعْنِ عَلَى أَئِمَّةِ الدِّينِ بِأَنَّ جَمْمُوعَ
مَا صَحَّ عِنْدُكُمْ مِنَ الْأَحَادِيثِ لَمْ
يَبْلُغْ رُهَاءَ عَشَرَةَ آلَافٍ

وَ نَقَلَ عَنِ الْبُخَارِيِّ أَنَّهُ قَالَ
حَفِظْتُ مِنَ الصَّحَاحِ مِائَةَ أَلْفٍ
حَدِيثٍ وَ مِنْ غَيْرِ الصَّحَاحِ مِائَتَيْ
أَلْفٍ وَ الظَّاهِرُ وَاللهُ أَعْلَمُ أَنَّهُ يُرِيدُ
الصَّحِيحَ عَلَى شَرْطِهِ

The total amount of what has been narrated in his book [Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī], including repetition, is seven thousand two hundred and seventy-five (7,275) hadīth. After omitting the repetitive ḥadīth, they become four thousand (4,000).¹

Other scholars from amongst the Imams [of ḥadīth] have also authored collections of *sahīh* ḥadīth, such as the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Ibn Khuzaymah², who is called “the Imam of the Imams”.

He is the *shaykh* of Ibn Ḥibbān³, who said in his praise: “I have not seen anyone on the face of the earth better in the science of the prophetic tradition nor better in memorizing the sound wording [of ḥadīth] than him, as if all the prophetic traditions and reports were right before his eyes.”

[Likewise, there is] the *Ṣaḥīḥ*⁴ of Ibn Ḥibbān, the student of Ibn Khuzaymah and a reliable, trustworthy, eminent Imam of deep understanding.

وَ مَبْلَغُ مَا أَوْرَدَ فِي هَذَا الْكِتَابِ مَعَ التَّكْرَارِ سَبْعَةُ آلَافٍ وَ مِائَتَانِ وَ خَمْسُونَ وَ سَبْعُونَ حَدِيثًا وَ بَعْدَ حَذْفِ التَّكْرَارِ أَرْبَعَةُ آلَافٍ

وَ لَقْدْ صَنَفَ الْأَخْرُونَ مِنَ الْأَئِمَّةِ صِحَّاحًا مِثْلَ صَحِّحِ ابْنِ حُزَيْمَةِ الَّذِي يُقَالُ لَهُ إِمَامُ الْأَئِمَّةِ

وَ هُوَ شَيْخُ ابْنِ حِبَّانَ وَ قَالَ ابْنُ حِبَّانَ فِي مَدْحِيهِ مَا رَأَيْتُ عَلَى وَجْهِ الْأَرْضِ أَحَدًا أَحْسَنُ فِي صِنَاعَةِ السُّنْنِ وَ أَحْفَظُ لِلْأَلْفَاظِ الصَّحِّيْحَةِ مِنْهُ كَأَنَّ السُّنْنَ وَ الْأَحَادِيْثَ كُلُّهَا نُصْبَ عَيْنِهِ

وَ مِثْلَ صَحِّحِ ابْنِ حِبَّانَ تِلْمِيْذِ ابْنِ حُزَيْمَةِ ثَقَةٌ ثَبَّتُ فَاضِلٌ إِمَامٌ فَهَامٌ

Al-Ḥākim once said: “Ibn Ḥibbān was from the vessels of knowledge, language, ḥadīth, and religious exhortation. He was from amongst the men of intellect.”

وَ قَالَ الْحَاكِمُ كَانَ ابْنُ حِبَّانَ مِنْ
أَوْعِيَةِ الْعِلْمِ وَاللُّغَةِ وَالْحَدِيثِ وَالْوَعْظَ
وَ كَانَ مِنْ عُقَلَاءِ الرِّجَالِ

[Likewise, there is] the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of the trustworthy Ḥāfiẓ al-Ḥākim Abū ‘Abdullāh al-Nīsābūrī that is [more commonly] called the *Mustadrak*.

وَ مِثْلُ صَحِيحِ الْحَاكِمِ أَبِي عَبْدِ اللَّهِ
النِّيْسَابُورِيِّ الْحَافِظِ الشَّفِيِّ الْمُسَمَّى
بِالْمُسْتَدْرَكِ

Leniency in ḥadīth ruling found its way into his book, however, and the scholars have held it against him, saying that “Ibn Khuzaymah and Ibn Ḥibbān are stronger and more established than al-Ḥākim and they are better and sharper in [understanding] the ḥadīth chains and texts.¹

وَ قَدْ تَطَرَّقَ فِي كِتَابِهِ هَذَا التَّسَاهُلُ
وَ أَخَذُوا عَلَيْهِ وَ قَالُوا ابْنُ حُزَيْمَةَ وَ
ابْنُ حِبَّانَ أَمْكَنُ وَ أَقْوَى مِنْ
الْحَاكِمِ وَ أَحْسَنُ وَ أَلْطَفُ فِي
الْأَسَانِيدِ وَ الْمُتُونِ

[Likewise, there is] the *al-Mukhtārah* of Ḥāfiẓ Ḏiyā’ al-Dīn al-Maqdisī, who also transmitted *ṣaḥīḥ* ḥadīth that are not found in the two *Ṣaḥīḥs* (of Bukhārī and Muslim).

وَ مِثْلُ الْمُخْتَارَةِ لِلْحَافِظِ ضِيَاءِ
الدِّينِ الْمَقْدِسِيِّ وَ هُوَ أَيْضًا خَرَّاجٌ
صِحَّاحًا لَيْسَتْ فِي الصَّحِيحَيْنِ

The scholars have said that “his book is better than the *Mustadrak*.”

وَ قَالُوا كِتَابَهُ أَحْسَنُ مِنَ
الْمُسْتَدْرَكِ

[Likewise there are] the *Sahīhs* of Ibn 'Awānah¹ and Ibn al-Sakan² as well as the *Muntaqā* of Ibn Jārūd³.

وَ مِثْلَ صَحِيحِ ابْنِ عَوَانَةَ وَ ابْنِ
السَّكَنِ وَ الْمُنْتَقَى لِابْنِ جَارُودٍ

All of these books were [meant to be] exclusive to *sahīh* ḥadīth, although a group of scholars have criticized [them], some out of bigotry and some justly.⁴ And above every person of knowledge is the All-Knowing, and Allah knows best.

وَ هَذِهِ الْكُتُبُ كُلُّهَا مُخْتَصَّةٌ
بِالصَّحَاحِ وَ لَكِنَّ جَمَاعَةً انْتَقَدُوا
تَعَصُّبًا أَوْ إِنْصَافًا وَ فَوْقَ كُلِّ ذِي
عِلْمٍ عَلِيمٌ وَ اللَّهُ أَعْلَمُ.

Chapter Ten: The Six Famous ḥadīth Collections The Six Books:

The six famous canonical books of ḥadīth in Islam, called the *Ṣihāh Sitt*, are:

1. The *Sahīh* of Bukhārī
2. The *Sahīh* of Muslim
3. The *Jāmi'* of Tirmidhī
4. The *Sunan* of Abū Dāwūd
5. [The *Sunan*] of Nasā'ī
6. The *Sunan* of Ibn Mājah

فَصْلٌ

الْكُتُبُ السِّتَّةُ الْمَشْهُورَةُ الْمُقَرَّرَةُ فِي
الإِسْلَامِ الَّتِي يُقَالُ لَهَا الصَّحَاحُ
السَّتُّ هِيَ صَحِيحُ الْبُخَارِيِّ وَ
صَحِيحُ مُسْلِمٍ وَاجْمَاعُ لِتِرْمِذِيِّ وَ

السَّنَنُ لِأَبِي دَاوُودَ وَ النَّسَائِيِّ وَ

سُنْنُ ابْنِ مَاجَةَ

وَ صَاحِبُ جَامِعِ الْأَصْوَلِ اخْتَارَ
الْمُوَطَّأَ

The author of *Jāmi‘ al-Usūl*, however, chose the *Muwaṭṭa* [as the sixth of the books in place of *Sunan Ibn Mājah*].

In the [last] four books all types of ḥadīth can be found: *sahīh*, *hasan*, and *da‘īf*. That they are termed “six *sahīh* collections” is due to the predominance [of *sahīh* ḥadīth in them].

وَ فِي هَذِهِ الْكُتُبِ الْأَرْبَعَةِ أَقْسَامٌ
مِنَ الْأَحَادِيثِ مِنَ الصَّحَاحِ وَ
الْحِسَانِ وَالضَّعَافِ وَ تَسْمِيَتُهَا
بِالصَّحَاحِ السَّتُّ بِطَرِيقِ التَّغْلِيْبِ

وَ سَمِّيَ صَاحِبُ الْمَصَابِيحِ أَحَادِيثَ
غَيْرِ الشَّيْخَيْنِ بِالْحِسَانِ وَ هُوَ قَرِيبُ
مِنْ هَذَا الْوَجْهِ قَرِيبٌ مِنَ الْمَعْنَى
الْلُّغَوِيِّ أَوْ هُوَ اصْطِلَاحٌ جَدِيدٌ مِنْهُ

وَ قَالَ بَعْضُهُمْ كِتَابُ الدَّارِمِيِّ
أَخْرَى وَ أَلَيْقُ بِجَعْلِهِ سَادِسَ الْكُتُبِ

[It should be noted that] the author of *Maṣābiḥ [al-Sunnah]* (Imam Baghawī) termed the ḥadīth related by those other than Bukhārī and Muslim as *hasan*, and in this usage he either meant [that the ḥadīth in them are predominantly *hasan*] or he meant the linguistic meaning of “good, fair”, or he simply intended to formulate a new term.

Some scholars have said that the book of Dārimī is more appropriate and deserving to be the sixth of the [canonical ḥadīth] books because its narrators are less weak and the presence of

munkar and *shādhah* ḥadīth in it is rare. It also has lofty chains and more *thulāthiyāt* (chains containing only three narrators between the author and the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace) than the *thulāthiyāt* of Bukhārī.

The above-mentioned books are amongst the most popular books [of ḥadīth], otherwise there are many other famous books.

Suyūṭī has narrated from many books, exceeding in fact fifty, in the book *Jam' al-Jawāmi'*. They consist of *ṣaḥīḥ*, *ḥasan*, and *da'if* ḥadīth.

He said: "I did not mention in [this book] a ḥadīth that is characterized as fabricated and that the scholars of ḥadīth have agreed upon its abandonment and rejection." And Allah knows best.²

لأنَّ رِجَالَهُ أَقْلَى ضَعْفًا وَ وُجُودًا
الْأَحَادِيثُ الْمُنْكَرَةُ وَ الشَّاذَّةُ نَادِرٌ
وَ لَهُ أَسَانِيدٌ عَالِيَّةٌ وَ ثُلَاثَيَّاتُهُ أَكْثَرُ
مِنْ ثُلَاثَيَّاتِ الْبُخَارِيِّ

وَ هَذِهِ الْمَذْكُورَاتُ مِنَ الْكُتُبِ
أَشْهَرُ الْكُتُبِ وَ غَيْرُهَا مِنَ الْكُتُبِ
كَثِيرَةٌ شَهِيرَةٌ
وَ لَقَدْ أَوْرَدَ السُّيُوطِيُّ فِي كِتَابِ جَمْعِ
الْجُواِمِعِ مِنْ كُتُبٍ كَثِيرَةٌ يَتَجَاهَوْزُ
بِخَمْسِينَ مُشْتَمِلَةٍ عَلَى الصَّحَاحِ وَ
الْحِسَانِ وَ الضَّعَافِ
وَ قَالَ مَا أَوْرَدْتُ فِيهَا حَدِيثًا
مَوْسُومًا بِالْوَضْعِ اتَّفَقَ الْمُحَدِّثُونَ
عَلَى تَرْكِهِ وَ رَدِّهِ وَ اللَّهُ أَعْلَمُ

وَ ذَكَرَ صَاحِبُ الْمِشْكَاهِ فِي
دِيْبَاجَةِ كِتَابِهِ جَمَاعَةً مِنَ الْأَئِمَّةِ

الْمُتَقِنِينَ وَ هُمُ الْبُخَارِيُّ وَ مُسْلِمٌ وَ
الْإِمَامُ مَالِكٌ وَ الْإِمَامُ الشَّافِعِيُّ وَ
الْإِمَامُ أَحْمَدُ بْنُ حَنْبَلٍ وَ التَّرْمِذِيُّ وَ
أَبُو دَاؤُودَ وَ النَّسَائِيُّ وَ ابْنُ مَاجَةَ وَ
الْدَّارِمِيُّ وَ الدَّارَقُطْنِيُّ وَ الْبَيْهَقِيُّ وَ
رَزِينُ وَ أَجْمَلٌ فِي ذِكْرِ غَيْرِهِمْ

وَ كَتَبْنَا أَحْوَاهُمْ فِي كِتَابٍ مُفَرِّدٍ
مُسَمَّى بِالْإِكْمَالِ بِذِكْرِ أَسْمَاءِ
الرِّجَالِ وَ مِنَ اللَّهِ التَّوْفِيقُ وَ هُوَ
الْمُسْتَعَانُ فِي الْمَبْدَأِ وَ الْمَآلِ + وَ
أَمَّا الإِكْمَالُ فِي أَسْمَاءِ الرِّجَالِ
لِصَاحِبِ الْمِشْكَاهِ فَهُوَ مُلْحَقٌ فِي
آخِرِ هَذَا الْكِتَابِ.